

Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, June 5, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we come together this morning to open another session of the Senate our hearts are saddened with the news of the passing of one of the eminent statesmen of this great country. We think of his career, in which Thou didst lead him on. Through all the tract of the years he wore the white flower of a stainless life. He presided with dignity and with justice in this place. He gave his life to the highest interests of his country.

We pray that as Thou dost call us day by day to face the solemn responsibilities of life, in view of the passing of so many, our hearts may be chastened and refined that we may have a regard for the final issue.

We pray now Thy blessing, O God, upon our land and country. Still raise up men able to lead us onward along the lines of the higher ideals of our fathers and give us the final victory. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, June 3, 1918, when, on request of Mr. Smoot and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DEATH OF HON. CHARLES WARREN FAIRBANKS.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, as one of the representatives from Indiana in this body, it becomes my painful duty to announce to the Senate the death at his home in Indianapolis last evening of the Hon. Charles Warren Fairbanks, for eight years a Member of this body and for four years its presiding officer. In accordance with the precedents I shall introduce a resolution providing that the Senate adjourn as a mark of respect for the character and the services of this eminent statesman.

Senator Fairbanks was a well-rounded and symmetrical man. He had that indefinable trait that we call poise. He was well balanced. He was a student by inclination. The very bent of his genius early led him into the law and then into politics, a path that has been so frequently trod by many men who have become conspicuous in the history of the Republic.

Mr. President, Senator Fairbanks became a Member of this body on the 4th of March, 1897, and until his elevation to the Vice Presidency he served his State and his country with peculiar fidelity and with signal ability.

In debate he was argumentative but never abusive, for he conducted all of his battles on the high plane of principle. Members heard him gladly, for they knew that he had investigated every phase of the question under discussion and that he would give to them the results of his honest thought. All men believed him to be sincere. His very bearing forbade the thought of subterfuge. He was an indefatigable worker, and therefore he came full armed to the discussion of every problem he chose to debate.

As presiding officer of the Senate, those who were Members of this body during his incumbency will attest the statement that he presided with fairness and impartiality; that he was ever courteous and urbane; and that he never sought to take any partisan advantage of his position. His conduct at all times was marked by a dignity rarely seen, and his very presence impressed all those who met him with the nobility of his character.

Senator Fairbanks was the most eminent citizen of my State in private life, and his death will be universally mourned by the people of that Commonwealth, who everywhere respected and admired him for his worth as a man, his work as a citizen, and his services as a statesman.

He was known to all of them as a man of spotless reputation and unblemished character, and he was held in this esteem by men of all parties, notwithstanding his leadership in many bitter campaigns.

They all regarded him as their friend, just as all knew him to possess those qualities they could trust. They never doubted him in either private or public life, for they knew the solid granite of his character. His fame will go down to a far day among them as one who bore well the burdens of life, who was a loving father, who was a respected citizen, who won the admiration of all with whom he came in contact because of those enduring traits of character that made the man.

Mr. President, inasmuch as he is not a Member of this body extended remarks would not be in order, and therefore I content myself by offering the following resolutions:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Indiana.

The Secretary read the resolutions (S. Res. 257), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. Charles Warren Fairbanks, a former Member of this body from the State of Indiana, later Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the illustrious dead the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I think sorrow and sadness was brought to every Member of this body when it was announced last night that Vice President Fairbanks had passed away. I believe I hazard nothing in saying the Senate has never had a presiding officer who discharged the duties of his position with more ability, fidelity, and fairness than they were discharged by Vice President Fairbanks. He not only commanded the confidence and esteem but the affectionate regard of every Senator who served in this body with him, and I may say of every Senator, and, indeed, of all who ever knew him before or after his service in this body.

I am very sure, Mr. President, there is not a Member of the Senate who would be willing to proceed with the business of the Senate until we paid by an adjournment the highest tribute it is in our power at this time to pay to Vice President Fairbanks.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 6, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, June 5, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, though our faith in human nature has been strained to well-nigh the breaking through the barbarous methods of warfare introduced by the Germans and their allies, with a view of terrorizing the world and destroying human rights, help us to realize that it is through a false and vicious education, systematically followed up for more than a half century in their homes, their schools, and from their pulpits, which is opposed to the gospel message, the thunderings of Sinai, the prophets and seers of old, and is therefore unnatural, inhuman, expressed in the indignation of all civilized peoples.

Help us, therefore, to stand fast to our convictions, and, though faith may long be delayed, it will vindicate itself in the wisdom, power, and goodness of God, who lives and reigns in the hearts of all true men, in Jesus Christ the expressed image of the Father.

O Love, O Life, our faith and sight
Thy presence maketh one;
As through transfigured clouds of white
We trace the noonday sun.

So, to our mortal eyes subdued,
Flesh-veiled, but not concealed,
We know in Thee the fatherhood
And heart of God revealed.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LANGLEY and Mr. RANDALL rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes, but before that the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Gen. HOLLINGSWORTH, of Ohio, who is delayed at his home, delivered a patriotic address on Memorial Day, which I think is a very remarkable one, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a patriotic speech made by Gen. HOLLINGSWORTH, of Ohio, on Memorial Day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for three minutes.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, was consent granted to the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is rather inclined to think it was, but I will put the question over again. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I rather think that consent was not granted. I reserve the right to object, with the view of finding out what subject the gentleman intends to speak about. He has a bottle in his hand. What he intends to do with it I do not know.

Mr. RANDALL. I intend to speak concerning an item that appeared in the Washington Times of last night about finding beer bottles in the House Office Building.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think that is a peculiar circumstance?

Mr. RANDALL. That is what I propose to elucidate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wish to ask the gentleman if he intends to propose any action, because if the article to which he refers is unfair in reflecting upon the great body of the Representatives of the people, to continue that sort of discussion may not be wise.

Mr. RANDALL. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I propose to show by evidence on this bottle that the finding of this bottle in the House Office Building is simply a "plant" made by some one. I will prove it by the statement on the bottle.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is in this position, that if he suspects a plant in the House Office Building, which might apply as well to any other branch of the Capitol, it would be possible for certain designing men, having photographers along, to place a barrel of empty whisky bottles before the door of the gentleman from California, who is a confirmed prohibitionist, and it might affect the gentleman's chances for reelection in California.

Mr. RANDALL. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the whole thing is disgraceful and disgusting and is not entitled to attention. The only reason I ask for these few minutes in which to say something about it is because the Washington Times has been making it appear, or attempting to make it appear, that I am cooperating with that paper in trying to discover empty whisky bottles and beer bottles in the House Office Building.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is no objection to the gentleman proceeding; but I will say this, that the gentleman is just as likely to be made a victim of a plant of whisky and beer bottles put before his door as anybody else in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think he needs any defense in the House of Representatives as to what the Washington Times says?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question.

The SPEAKER. I wish everybody would speak loud enough to be heard.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he is indifferent to the conditions to which the Times has called attention?

Mr. GARNER. I am, so far as I am individually concerned, entirely indifferent to it, because I do not think it is any business of the Times or of anybody else as to what gentlemen do when they do not violate the law.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection to the gentleman from California proceeding for three minutes?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question.

Does the gentleman from California feel that he is under a ban and has to clear his motive?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. No; the regular order has been demanded. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Go ahead. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears none.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the late edition of the brewers' journal of last night, otherwise known as the Washington Times [laughter], this item appears:

A Times reporter discovers 38 empty whisky bottles in a box in the House Office Building—Congressman RANDALL and a Times reporter find 26 empty beer bottles in a storeroom on the fifth floor of the building.

Mr. Speaker, the Times reporter came to my office yesterday morning and said he had heard of some more bottles in the House Office Building, and wanted to know if I would go up and help him discover them. I said, "No; I am not interested." He continued to talk for a while, and then went over to my telephone and called up some one and got information as to where these bottles were, and said, "I have just found out where they are. If you want to see them, will you go up?" I said, "All right." We went up to the attic and he looked along the hall for a while—more in the air than anywhere else—and then finally said, "Here they are," and stepped behind a pile of mail sacks, where there was a box of beer bottles tied up with a string, and covered so that they could not be discovered unless he had known where they were. He pulled out the box, which was a paper carton, and opened it, untied the fresh string that was around it, and pulled out 26 beer bottles. This is one of the bottles [exhibiting].

Mr. DYER. What brand is it? [Laughter.]

Mr. RANDALL. In that attic when anything lies up there a few months it is covered with dust. This box, with the string around it, was freshly placed there. I examined the bottles carefully, and I found on the labels, which is the Faust brand of beer, the notorious brand of St. Louis, "Alcohol, 4½ per cent."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States issued an order on December 8, 1917, reducing the alcoholic content of beer to 2½ per cent, and a bottle in the House Office Building, in a box freshly placed there containing bottles labeled "Alcohol, 4½ per cent," evidently was bought of some junk shop and placed there very recently in order to bolster up this cheap slander which the Washington Times is conducting against the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

ALIEN SLACKERS.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for four minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, under the call of the President 1,000,000 of our young men are to-day registering for military service. It is an appropriate moment perhaps to call attention to the Nation's progress, or rather utter lack of progress, in solving the alien-slacker problem. In spite of the extreme gravity and importance of the question not one thing has been done. We have been in a state of coma, which has apparently been growing more and more acute and hopeless as the months have passed.

Let me review very briefly the chronology:

1. The draft law was signed by the President May 18, 1917.

2. Ten million men between 21 and 31 registered June 5. As I pointed out in a rather extended speech delivered in this House on July 13, over one-eighth of the number, about a million and a quarter in all, were aliens and exempt from the draft. In some States the percentage of alien registrants to total registrants was 35 or 40 per cent. Yet the quotas of these States were based on total population, although one-third or more of that population was exempted outright. The unfair and unjust drain upon the citizen population of these communities was manifest. The spectacle of the young alien stepping into the job of the drafted American was not an agreeable one. But running still deeper was the conviction of our people that the alien who had come to our shores, obtaining our protection and enjoying our freedom and prosperity, must not escape without the slightest obligation to defend the United States in its struggle for existence.

3. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs on August 1 unanimously reported out a resolution which I had introduced and which had the express sanction of the President and the Secretary of State. This resolution called upon the Secretary of

State to enter into treaties for the inclusion in our draft of the subjects of foreign countries residing in this country.

4. On August 1 the Senate unanimously passed a practically identical resolution.

5. On September 12 the Senate passed the drastic Chamberlain bill, providing for the draft of all aliens except enemy aliens and aliens protected by treaty. This resolution, upon the personal request of the Secretary of State, was killed later in September by the House Committee on Military Affairs and has never been resurrected.

6. On February 27, after repeated postponements requested by the Secretary of State, the House passed the Burnett bill, providing deportation for the aliens who did not submit to the draft. This bill apparently is as dead as the Chamberlain bill, no action having been taken by the Senate.

7. Presumably pursuant to the action of Congress of last August the Secretary of State on February 27 finally submitted to the Senate drafts of treaties with Great Britain and Canada for the mutual drafting of the subjects of each country residing in the other. On March 22, two and one-half months ago, the Secretary withdrew the treaties. They have not been resubmitted.

Here the story stops. Fourteen months after the declaration of war and 13 months after the enactment of the draft law nothing has been done in spite of the warranted and insistent demand of the whole country for speedy action. Millions of our men are going forth to the war, yet no alien need accompany them to defend their common country.

"How long?" Is there no end to the delay? Can it be that we can not agree with those allies by whose side we are fighting for our lives? Surely the cordial feelings between us must make possible an immediate meeting of minds. Surely each nation will gladly yield in matters of detail. Surely the nations must not in this regard appear as bargainers, each seeking its utmost advantage. The common cause is far too great to be belittled by any such attitude. Let us get together in this as in all else.

CHARLES WARREN FAIRBANKS.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard with the deep sorrow of the death last night of Hon. Charles Warren Fairbanks at his home in Indianapolis, Ind.

For many years Mr. Fairbanks has been prominently identified with public affairs, not only of the State but of the Nation. Twice elected to represent the State of Indiana in the Senate of the United States, resigning from that position when elected as Vice President of the United States, he has filled every position with honor and credit, not only to himself but to his country. Indiana will ever hold in loving remembrance the high character and the unblemished record of Charles Warren Fairbanks.

My colleague, Mr. Wood, has been more intimately associated with Mr. Fairbanks than any other member of the Indiana delegation, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be given 10 minutes in which to address the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that his colleague, Mr. Wood of Indiana, may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to thank my colleague, Mr. Dixon, for making this request and the House for granting it.

Announcement is made this morning through the public press of the death of Charles Warren Fairbanks, of Indiana. While Mr. Fairbanks was never a Member of this body, he served for eight years as a Member of the Senate, and was Vice President of the United States for four years. I therefore think it but fitting that the deliberations of this body should be paused for a moment out of respect to the memory of this eminent citizen.

Time forbids an elaboration upon his virtues or an extended detail of his public service to State and Nation.

His life and his achievements furnish a most striking example of the possibilities that may be attained by every American youth who has innate ability, integrity of purpose, indomitable courage, and abundant energy. From a log cabin in the woods of Ohio, where he was born, within the span of 66 years, he marched from obscurity through the gates of fame; and he blazed the path himself, unaided by parental fortune or official influence. God blessed him with a giant stature and a splendid brain. These implements were sufficient for his success. As a farmer boy, newspaper reporter, lawyer, and statesman, he performed well his part, and he never sought advancement until he was sure of his course and his ability to hold advanced position.

The great ambition of Senator Fairbanks as a boy was to be a successful lawyer, and all the things else that he did were

preparatory stepping stones to this end. After being admitted to the bar in Ohio he removed to Indianapolis, Ind., in 1874, to make that rapidly growing commercial city his future home. He was a stranger in a strange city, but he had chosen a fertile field in which to employ his talents. There were giants in the practice of law in Indianapolis then, many of whom had national reputation as lawyers. Among them were Benjamin Harrison, Thomas A. Hendricks, Joseph E. McDonald, Walter Q. Gresham, Abe Hendricks, John W. Butler, Jonathan Gordon, Tom Brown, George W. Julian, and a score of others. Among this imposing coterie of lawyers Mr. Fairbanks began the practice in a modest way, and rapidly advanced until within a very few years he was a peer with the eminent practitioners that I have just named.

While primarily engrossed in the practice of law, Mr. Fairbanks found time to take part in the political affairs of Indiana, and from 1888, when he acted as manager of the forces supporting Walter Q. Gresham for President of the United States as against Benjamin Harrison, down to his death there was never a campaign in Indiana in which Mr. Fairbanks did not take an active part. He was the unanimous choice of his party for the United States Senate in 1897 and again in 1903. He served in that body continuously for eight years, and was then elected Vice President of the United States for four years. He was in the Senate during all the time that McKinley was President. He was President McKinley's fast and devoted friend, and this friendship was reciprocated. Had it not been for the untimely death of the President, in all probability Mr. Fairbanks would have succeeded him. Senator Mark Hanna, who was closer to President McKinley than any other living man, said soon after the death of the President that the greatest personal loss sustained by any man in the death of McKinley was sustained by Charles W. Fairbanks, of Indiana, and that in his opinion Fairbanks would have been his logical successor.

Mr. Fairbanks was a Republican of the old school, and he never deviated from the cardinal principles of the party. Others wandered away for a time and returned, but he remained steadfast throughout. In 1892, when the whole country seemed to be going wild on the subject of free silver, Mr. Fairbanks, as chairman of the Indiana Republican State convention, declared that "the Republican Party stands for a sound and honest dollar and must ever stand for a stable currency." In 1896 he wrote a plank into the Republican platform of Indiana declaring in favor of the gold standard, and, through mighty opposition, had it adopted by the convention. It took great courage then to do this thing, but Fairbanks was a man of courage whenever and wherever principle was involved. He was the temporary chairman of the Republican national convention in 1896, and his speech delivered on that occasion was the keynote for the ensuing campaign. In it he was bold to declare for sound money and a protective tariff, and in his adherence to these two fundamental principles of the Republican Party he never wavered.

After Senator Fairbanks retired from public life he did not go into seclusion, as many others have done, and he never lost interest in matters that pertain to the welfare either of the State or Nation. He was ever ready to respond to any service assigned him, no matter what it was, and he always dignified that service. He was a member of the commission for the State of Indiana to the Panama Exposition held at San Francisco. He took as much interest in the duties devolving upon him in that capacity as he did in every other official duty, and the speech that he made at the dedication of the Indiana Building on the exposition grounds was one of the greatest public utterances he ever made.

He was kind and affable always; ever a courteous gentleman. As a Member of the United States Senate he won the respect of all his associates. As Vice President of the United States and presiding officer of the Senate he made a reputation for fairness seldom equaled and never excelled by any of his predecessors.

When this war broke out Mr. Fairbanks immediately tendered his services to the State and to the Nation, and there was not a day, until stricken by his last illness, but what he did something for his country. He was on a speaking tour in behalf of the second liberty loan when his physical breakdown came, from which he never rallied.

His was a well-rounded life, but he died too soon. There was still much for him to do. There was still much that he would like to have done for the country he so truly loved. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of

the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 9959. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the roster of committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SAFETY OF EMPLOYEES AND TRAVELERS UPON RAILROADS.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I call up House bill 10297.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10297) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar, and the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for its consideration, with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] in the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10297, with Mr. LINTHICUM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10297, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, be, and is hereby, amended as follows:

In the thirteenth line of section 3 strike out the word "four" and insert the word "five," and in the fourteenth line of section 3 strike out the word "three" and insert the word "four."

In the fourteenth line of section 4 strike out the words "one thousand eight hundred" and insert the words "three thousand."

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the act entitled 'An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto,' approved February 7, 1911, as amended, be, and is hereby, amended as follows:

"Amend section 3 so as to provide that the salary of the chief inspector shall be \$5,000 per year; the salary of each assistant inspector shall be \$4,000 per year.

"Amend section 4 so as to provide that the salary of each district inspector shall be \$3,000 per year."

"Sec. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as amending, altering, or repealing any of the other provisions of said sections."

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, two years ago a bill similar to this, in fact identical in almost every respect, was introduced, favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and passed the House, but failed to receive consideration in the Senate.

The object of this bill is to increase the salary of the chief inspector of the Boiler-Inspection Service from \$4,000 to \$5,000 a year, and the salaries of the two assistants from \$3,000 to \$4,000, and to make the salaries of the district inspectors \$3,000.

The boiler-inspection law was passed in 1911 or 1912. It was passed simply as a boiler-inspection law, with no duties other than those pertaining to boilers, and the salaries fixed at that time were fixed with reference to the service being limited to boiler inspection only. After that Congress amended the law and included the inspection of engines and tenders, which doubled the work and responsibilities of the inspectors, without increasing the compensation therefor. These inspectors have performed a valuable service along the line of securing greater safety to the traveling public and to the trainmen themselves. I wish to read a few statements made in behalf of the bill as a part of my remarks. This service is under the Interstate Commerce Commission, and Commissioner Charles C. McChord, the member of the commission under whom these men serve, was before the committee. I will read only a part of his statement as follows:

I think these salaries ought to be increased. I think the bill is fair and just, and I think the amount fixed there—\$5,000 for the chief inspector, and \$4,000 for the other two assistants, and \$3,000 for the other inspectors—is fair and right. I do not believe we can hold our men unless we do that, although they have been loyal and stuck to us when they have had offers, a good many of them, elsewhere. They are all thoroughly competent, and they have had experience. I think they are worthy of the money that this bill provides, and I am very anxious to see them get it, because I know their value and I know that they are worth it.

Mr. W. S. Stone, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, made the following statement:

I simply want to say this, and I will only take two or three minutes, that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, as you know, is the father of the boiler-inspection law. With the help of our good friends we finally got it, and we had a selfish motive in it. We were not only trying to save the lives of the traveling public but of our men, and we are vitally interested in having good inspection; and this bill meets with our hearty approval because we know we are not going to be able to keep these men unless we can pay them a living wage. We all know what the cost of living is at the present time as compared with a year or two ago, and they feel it just as much as any other people.

I approach this subject from the selfish standpoint of the executive officer of a great organization. For example, last month we paid insurance for 102 engineers. Twenty-two of those engineers were killed on duty; 43 died from pneumonia, undoubtedly due to exposure and to leaky engines and the severe weather. So we hope that you gentlemen can see your way clear to report out this bill as it is drafted and give it your indorsement, because it is absolutely necessary to keep these men. These railroads must be kept running. We must surround these railroads and the men who operate them, as well as the traveling public, with every safeguard possible. The Director General of the Railroads has just said to the executive officers of these organizations that we can not win this war unless we can keep these railroads running to their limit; and in order to do that we want the best inspection possible.

I will not read from others, as the statements are all along the same line. When this bill was passed the inspectors of the Interstate Commerce Commission of like rank and grade were paid only \$1,800. This was six years ago. The district inspectors, of whom there are 50, have to pass a rigid special examination to test their qualifications. They are not simply inspectors, but they are inspectors in chief, because they have all the inspectors of the railroads under them. Their work has been doubled, and their responsibility doubled, without any increase whatever in compensation. Two years ago, when the bill was reported and passed, the committee put the salaries of the district inspectors at \$2,400. This was an increase of \$600 a year. We believe that \$3,000 is more in harmony with the service performed by these men, with the salaries of the assistant chief at \$4,000, and of the chief inspector at \$5,000. The cost of maintaining an ordinary family has certainly increased very materially over what it was at that time. Therefore I think \$3,000, or \$250 a month for the district inspectors, who must travel all the time, and who have all the railroad inspectors, both as to boilers and engines, under their supervision and care, is not too great an increase, although I admit that the percentage of increase is large.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I want to say that this increase of the salaries of the district inspectors is one of the few salary increases which I favor; but I want to ask the gentleman if his statement is correct that there are only 50 inspectors for all the locomotives in the United States?

Mr. SIMS. Only 50 district inspectors in service under the Interstate Commerce Commission in the enforcement of this safety-appliance law.

Mr. WALSH. For the entire United States?

Mr. SIMS. There is the chief inspector, Mr. McManamy, 2 assistant inspectors, and 50 district inspectors; that is all.

Mr. WALSH. That is for the entire country?

Mr. SIMS. For the whole United States.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me there ought to be more than that number.

Mr. SIMS. Probably there ought to be; but that shows the tremendous service they are performing.

Mr. FOSTER. There are other inspectors besides the district inspectors?

Mr. SIMS. No other Federal inspectors under the Interstate Commerce Commission. The railroads have their own inspectors, but these are the official inspectors of the United States Government, and the reduction in the number of accidents has been wonderful since they began their work.

Mr. FOSTER. These 50 district inspectors are the ones who travel and see that the law is enforced? That is it, is it?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. So that there are no others that do inspecting, except what is done by the railroad companies themselves.

Mr. SIMS. That is all; but these 50 inspectors do inspecting work personally.

Mr. RAYBURN. There are other inspectors in each district.

Mr. SIMS. No other Federal inspectors.

Mr. FOSTER. And these 50 inspectors do inspect all railroad boilers?

Mr. SIMS. And engines.

Mr. FOSTER. They travel around to see that it is done?

Mr. SIMS. They travel in their districts all the time. They do both inspecting and supervision.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, is it possible the Government would lose the services of any of these men if these salaries were not increased?

Mr. SIMS. They have already lost some of them. That is the trouble. Mr. McManamy has used his influence to retain them in the service when they are offered very greatly increased compensation to go elsewhere, and they have remained patriotically in the service. Mr. McManamy now has under his charge 78,000 locomotives.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman familiar with the salaries paid to the employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission who value the railroads?

Mr. SIMS. No; I am not well enough informed to answer questions about that matter.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the work done by these district inspectors of a nature that aids in the saving of human life?

Mr. SIMS. It is a life-saving service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The work done in the valuation of the railroads is more of a clerical character, and I wanted to know if the gentleman could make any comparison of their compensation with that of the compensation paid to these practical workers who are mechanical experts.

Mr. SIMS. I could not, for I have not looked that up; but I am just about to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING], who wrote the report on a similar bill two years ago, and the report has been largely followed by the committee at this time. I now propose to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING], who can, perhaps, answer questions in detail better than I can.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I hope he will; and before the gentleman closes I want to say that the work done by these inspectors is of very great importance, whereas it is a question whether the valuation of railroads is of any value whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the gentleman yields the floor, will he answer one question. In addition to the salary of \$1,800 do these district inspectors get any per diem?

Mr. SIMS. They get an expense allowance. Perhaps the gentleman from Wisconsin would like to use some of his time.

Mr. ESCH. I have also promised to yield to the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the original act relating to the inspection of locomotive boilers was passed in 1911. That act created a chief inspector, two assistants, and 50 district inspectors. Their duties were confined to locomotive boilers and nothing else.

In 1915, March 4, Congress passed an act extending the work of these inspectors to all parts of the locomotive, including airbrakes, couplings, grab irons, handholds, headlamps, and all other parts of the locomotive. When that act was passed it required that these inspectors appointed under the original act should take another civil-service examination to ascertain whether they would be fitted to fulfill the added duties created by the act of 1915, so that they would be capable of investigating the whole locomotive and determining whether it had any defects. This act of 1915 greatly increased the duties and responsibilities of these inspectors.

But the act of 1915 gave no increase of pay, and so it remained at \$1,800, the original amount fixed. I need scarcely dwell on the excellent results following the enactment of the act of 1911, but a few figures are significant.

In 1912, the first year after the enactment of the law, the injured were 1,005 and killed 91. In 1913, the second year after the passage of the act, the injured had been reduced to 911 and the killed to 36. In 1914 the injured had been reduced to 614 and the killed to 23. In 1915 the injured had been reduced to 467, while the killed amounted to only 13. No other department of the Government, having reference to the safety of human life, can make a showing as remarkable as that of this department investigating locomotives. Their duties being increased by the act of 1915 will have a tendency to further reduce the number of injured and the number of killed on locomotives.

In reference to these duties the act of 1915 extending the duties to the whole locomotive has compelled the inspectors to a further preparation for a more intensive study of all parts of the locomotive. They must have a knowledge of optical and electrical equipment, because most locomotives on trunk lines have electric headlamps; they must have a thorough knowledge of airbrakes and airbrake equipment, a knowledge of mechanical devices, for as you know these are being added to the locomotives almost month by month. So they have an enlarged field of operation with increase of responsibility, but with no increase of pay since the original act was passed.

In relation to expense they are allowed a per diem of \$4. I have gone through the testimony and picked out at random reports of inspectors, not selected with reference to any particular place, but all over the United States. They were asked to report on hotel expenses, home expenses, disparity of pay, and other items.

Here is the report of an inspector from Nashville, Tenn. He says:

Duties: On account of local conditions, I have to work 10 to 18 hours a day.

Hotel expenses: Nearly all hotels have the American plan in Tennessee, and while one could live some years ago on \$3 to \$4 per day, one has now to pay \$5 per day, with reduced quantity and quality of food.

Disparity of pay: Roundhouse foremen receive from \$165 to \$190 per month.

Here is another from the inspector at Jersey City, N. J.:

Household expenses: Household expenses have increased 50 per cent, and I have been compelled to draw upon my savings.

Hotel expenses: Practically all hotels in my district have advanced rates from \$1.50 to \$2.50 and \$2.50 to \$3; meals in proportion.

Clothing: Wearing apparel has increased in cost 75 per cent.

Here is still another from an inspector located in Chicago:

Disparity of pay: Foremen boiler makers receive from \$175 to \$225 per month; general boiler inspectors, \$175 to \$225 per month (with expense account); master mechanics, \$225 to \$275 per month (with expense account); superintendents of motive power, \$5,000 to \$7,000 per year. Our salaries are \$157.50 per month (with per diem).

Household expenses: Food, clothing, and rents have so increased that nothing can be saved for a rainy day.

These are the employees of the railroad companies and these are the salaries which these railroad companies are paying these men, and yet they are largely in excess of the pay given to these inspectors. I could cite many other illustrations. Here is another one from Chicago. He says:

Duties: Have increased since February, 1911, when we were required to inspect only locomotive boilers, while at present we have to inspect the entire locomotive and tender and to perform duties relative to maintenance and operation. The work takes the inspectors away from home 30 to 60 days at a time. Inspectors are obliged to jump here and there, investigate accidents, work on priority orders, and assist in railway operation, which causes added expense for laundry, hotel rooms, and other necessary charges.

Household expenses: Are as high as those on the road.

Hotel expenses: Two or three times higher than five years ago and steadily mounting—hotel rooms costing \$1 to \$1.25 are now \$2.25 to \$3; meals have increased from 50 cents to \$1 and \$1.50. Every other expense is correspondingly high.

Disparity of pay: The pay of an inspector is scarcely half that paid railway employees engaged in similar work.

So that judged from this testimony that comes from these inspectors in the field, we conclude that they must be away from their homes for the greater portion of each month; that their per diem allowance of \$4 is not sufficient; that some of them have to draw upon their savings in order that they may continue Government service. Some of them have been induced to leave the Government service because of larger pay offered them by private industries, and in these times when mechanics are so needed in shipyards and other industries it is difficult to resist the temptation of leaving the Government service and securing this higher pay. We must therefore give them a reasonable wage for the responsibilities they have to perform.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee as to the number of resignations of these district inspectors during the past six months?

Mr. ESCH. At the time the testimony was given, about two months ago, the chief inspector, Mr. McManamy, stated that three had resigned and that several had written with reference to a possible change of their employment. I can not give the gentleman any further detail than that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee what pay those three received in the new positions which they undertook?

Mr. ESCH. I understood one of them had an offer of \$350 a month. His pay then was \$157.50. Another I think had an offer that was very much in excess of the pay that he got from the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Those three instances, I suppose, were instances of men of superior ability who could fill more responsible positions than that of a district inspector.

Mr. ESCH. Oh, these district inspectors are high-class men. They have stood two civil-service tests since 1911.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might suggest also that the testimony shows that if it had not been for the importunities of the chief inspector himself others would have resigned.

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman think if this bill goes through fixing the salaries as proposed that that will stop their resigning and going into private employment where the private employer proposes to pay an increased salary?

Mr. ESCH. We are assured that it will have that effect. I have reason to believe that these men who have a great pride in their work because of the results they have accomplished will be willing to stand by their Government. It is a remarkable service. The accomplishments are unparalleled. The men

take a pride in their work, but when one of these Government inspectors has to draw upon his private savings in order to remain with the Government I am not one who can blame him if he seeks another job.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman state how many inspectors have been obliged to draw on their private savings in order to retain their positions?

Mr. ESCH. I have not gone through the reports of the inspectors, but I have noted three of them make that specific statement. I do not know how many others there may be.

Mr. STAFFORD. To what extent have they been obliged to draw upon their private savings?

Mr. ESCH. Oh, I could not tell the gentleman that.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. As I understand it, this increases the salary of the chief inspector from \$4,000 to \$5,000?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. And the assistants from \$3,000 to \$4,000?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. And the 50 assistants from \$1,800 to \$3,000?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. The allowance per diem will be the same?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. There is no increase in that?

Mr. ESCH. Not at all.

Mr. ROBBINS. Has this proposed increase been suggested to the Director General of Railways, since he has taken over the railways of the United States?

Mr. ESCH. I do not know that that comes within his jurisdiction.

Mr. SIMS. He has no power to act.

Mr. ROBBINS. These inspectors make their reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. And will continue, of course, to report to that commission.

Mr. ESCH. Yes. The bill does not change their status in that respect.

Mr. ROBBINS. There is no doubt that these assistant inspectors ought to be paid more, because they are a skilled class of men. This does not increase the number?

Mr. ESCH. Not at all.

Mr. SNOOK. In connection with the question that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has asked, I suggest that it was brought out in the hearings that the Director General and the Interstate Commerce Commission also used these men very largely at the time the railroads were being taken over, or just before, in respect to the state of the freight congestion.

Mr. ESCH. Yes; I thank the gentleman for suggesting that. I wish to say that these inspectors have been required to do a multitude of duties that are not directly concerned with locomotive inspection.

In January and February, during the congestion owing to the strenuous winter weather, Commissioner McChord, upon the suggestion of the Director General, had every one of these 50 inspectors go to the main terminals and centers of congestion and there report the actual circumstances from day to day and those reports were received and were very instrumental in suggesting to the Director General remedial orders, and these men did this in addition to their duties as inspectors of locomotives, and they spent nights and days in that task. I might say as to increases for these inspectors, while on the face of the bill it appears to be an increase of \$1,800 to \$3,000, making an increase of \$1,200, it must be remembered that this horizontal increase to Government employees now pending in the Senate or in conference amounts to \$120, and these men getting \$1,800 would be entitled to that increase. If they get \$3,000 as granted by this bill, they will not participate in that increase, so that really the increase they are getting by this legislation is not \$1,200 a year but \$1,080, and the total amount of increase therefore because of this bill is only \$54,000. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SIMS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak briefly concerning the provisions of this bill. I had the honor of serving during the last Congress on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. At that time a similar bill was before the committee, was reported to the House, and passed. The bill never passed the Senate and it is now again before the House for consideration. I took the trouble at that time to investigate the question of increasing the salaries of boiler inspectors. Under the law as it was originally passed their salary was fixed

at \$1,800 a year. I was thoroughly satisfied that it was wholly inadequate for the service these men rendered and for the standard of talent required in the work which they were expected to do. The bill as it passed the House at that time provided an increase for the district inspectors from \$1,800 to \$2,400 a year. I thought then that \$2,400 a year was less than the salary ought to be and that the bill should have provided for higher pay. Since then conditions have so changed that it makes it clearly justifiable in allowing these men \$3,000 a year. We all know that in the last year the tendency has been to increase wages everywhere, to increase pay everywhere, due to the high cost of living and to the extraordinary expenses that people are put to who are traveling about, and that of itself is a very potent reason why this increase should be made. Then there is another reason. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] stated that after the original law was passed the duties of these men had been largely increased. Originally they were required to inspect only the boilers of locomotives. Under the amendment to the law which was passed three or four years later their duties were extended to the entire locomotive and the tender in addition to the inspection of the boiler, and they were required to take an additional civil-service examination to determine their qualifications for these additional duties, and that was the condition two years ago when the bill passed the House at \$2,400 a year.

Since that time additional duties have been imposed on these men that justifies more salary. Under the Director General of Railroads the chief inspector has been put in charge of the entire locomotive power of the railroads of the country. He has made it the duty of the chief inspector through the district inspectors to see that the locomotive power of the country is kept in the best possible condition. When engines and boilers are defective they are sent to the repair shop and the inspectors are given jurisdiction and control over repairs. It is their duty to see to it that they are repaired with the greatest possible speed and again returned to active duty on the road. This increases their duties very greatly under the ruling of the Director of Railroads. I think in the first four years of the operation of this law these district inspectors inspected on an average of nearly 100,000 boilers every year. It ran from seventy-five to ninety-five thousand boilers every year that these men were required to inspect. On their order a defective boiler and a defective engine must now be returned to the shop, and they have ordered during that time nearly 15,000 boilers and locomotives returned to the repair shop where they found them not in proper condition for actual work of the road. When we come to consider the result, when we come to consider the fact that this work has accomplished in a great measure the purpose for which it was intended, we must agree that it was a very wise piece of legislation that Congress enacted when it passed this locomotive-boiler inspection law. Let me call attention to these figures. In 1912, the first year after the boiler-inspection law was passed, there were 91 persons killed during that year from defective boilers. From accidents arising from defective boilers during that year there were 1,005 persons injured.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. SIMS. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Three years later, after the law had been in operation from 1912 to 1915, and before the duties of these men had been extended to the entire locomotive and the tender, during the time when they were simply required to inspect the boilers alone, in 1915 there were only 13 persons killed from accidents arising from defective boilers, and instead of 1,005 persons injured from the same cause there were only 467 persons injured that year. This result can be traced as a direct result of this legislation. Every year from the time this law first went into effect down to the present time the accidents and injuries have gradually decreased from year to year just as the law became effective and just as the duties of these men operated upon the locomotives and the boilers in operation on the railroads of the country. I submit to the Members of the House that the proof is now clear that Congress has exercised great wisdom in the passage of four pieces of legislation intended to save human life and conserve human limbs on railroads. The first was the safety-appliance law, that applied to automatic couplers, to the brake system on railroads, to the grab irons, the handholds on cars. Another was the ash-pan act.

Another was this law providing for the inspection of boilers and locomotives, and the fourth law was the employers' liability act, which made the railroads responsible for seeing to it that they employed in these dangerous occupations on railroads only men qualified and competent to do the work. And it is a most interesting study to read the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on the gradual decrease of deaths, injuries, and accidents on railroads from the time these laws went into operation

to the present time. Under these laws conditions have so improved and will continue to improve so that the men working on railroads and the general public traveling on the railroads will be practically immune from danger due to accidents arising from defective machinery on trains and locomotives. I submit to the House that it is very important that the Interstate Commerce Commission be allowed latitude to select the very best men in the country, men best qualified to serve in this capacity, men competent and able to understand the duties they are to perform, so that the purpose and intent of the law be fully accomplished.

As has been stated, the railroad companies have been bidding higher for these men than the Government has been paying them. Two of them have already resigned to take higher pay with the railroad companies of the country. There has been a constant pressure from other sources to draw these men out of this employment into other employments, where they can command, and where, no doubt, they deserve and are entitled to better pay. If the railroad companies of the country can afford to pay these men better wages than \$1,800 a year, the Government of the United States can afford to do so, and it is of importance to the proper administration of the law that able and experienced men be retained in this service.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to say that I recognize the futility of accomplishing anything in this House that seeks to curtail expenditures in the increase of salaries of officials which has the indorsement of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. And yet I feel it incumbent upon me to bring to the attention of the committee this exceptional piece of legislation, which if we would use it as a warrant to increase the salaries of all Government employees according to the changed standard of living, would involve this Government to the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars. And yet this committee comes here and adopts this peculiar method of increasing the salaries of men from \$1,800 to \$3,000 at one swoop, increasing the salaries \$1,200 of men who are to-day receiving with their expense account and per diem of \$4 every day in the year, some of which is pure salary, an average, I may say, of \$2,600. The per diem that is allowed these men is paid them for every day in the year. As in other branches of the service they are paid that \$4 per day whether they are in the field or not. It is established that that per diem for one-half of the year is pure salary. So I am within bounds when I say that one-half of the per diem for each day in the year, or \$1,460, is salary. Now, these men to that extent are receiving \$2,530.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Do you believe that at this time one of these inspectors can travel the number of miles that he does and live on \$2 a day, paying his hotel expenses and paying for his meals?

Mr. STAFFORD. The testimony before the Committee on Appropriations is, and the testimony before the committee, of which the gentleman is a member, shows, they can live on \$4 a day. Now, if they can live on \$4 a day, which they are receiving, and only one-half of the days of the year they are in the field, therefore the remaining half of the days of the year is pure salary, or \$770.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I would ask the gentleman if he says that these men are only half of their time in the field?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. On what do you base that statement?

Mr. STAFFORD. Why, the statement here and in reading the hearings. Does the gentleman mean they are in the field 365 days in the year?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. No; but they are in the field more than half of their time.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much of the time are all of the inspectors in the field? Is there any testimony that the gentleman has that will deny the statement I have made that they are in the field on the average only half of the time?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I do not think the gentleman is correct in that.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not think. He has no proof to deny my statement.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has investigated these matters very carefully, I am sure. Is this \$4 per diem paid to these inspectors when they are in their home cities?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; paid every day in the year. It amounts to a total of \$1,460.

Mr. COX. If that is true, and I take it the gentleman has looked it up—

Mr. STAFFORD. I have the assurance of my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], that that is the rule.

Mr. COX. If that is true, I would like some member of this committee that has reported this bill to rise here and tell the Committee of the Whole why they are paying these men \$4 a day when they are staying at their homes.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the practice in other departments of the Government. Take, for instance, the Children's Bureau, connected with the Department of Labor, every employee of the Children's Bureau, in addition to their salary of \$1,800 or \$2,000, receives an allowance of \$4 per day for every day in the year even when stationed at one place for every day in the year. That is one of the abuses of the service. I would not underrate the value of these inspectors. It was my honor to serve in a past Congress under that great legislator, who was chairman of this committee, the Hon. JAMES R. MANN. It was he who brought this bill to the House, and it had my cordial support, providing for the inspection of boilers. The increase is asked for the additional duties required of them under the act of 1915, merely requiring under that act that they give some attention to some parts of the appurtenances of the locomotive and tender. The real reason for this inspection service, as was pointed out when we drafted this bill, was in determining the character of the boilers, whether they were fit to carry passenger trains and also fit for freight service. That was the main service. Now, as usual, when a raid is being made for salary increases, some little additional services with added responsibilities are cited as reasons for increasing these men to the extraordinary extent of \$1,200.

Now, what does the testimony show as to the salaries that are being paid by private employers for like work? I use the testimony cited by my distinguished colleague [Mr. ESCH], who has given this subject as much and perhaps more attention than any other Member of this House. He cited in support of this inordinate increase of salaries of men from \$1,800 to \$3,000, that general boiler inspectors—and certainly these men do not hold any higher grade than general boiler inspectors—were receiving \$175 to \$225 per month, and their expenses when traveling. Now, what does that show? Take the maximum figure, \$225 per month, and that is but \$2,700 a year. But they merely get their actual expense account, and we know that in private employment men have to itemize that, and they do not get any "velvet" out of the per diem allowance. But here we intend to give not only \$3,000, but we intend to give them \$3,730.

The role of a person who tries to keep down salaries is not a pleasant one. It is an ungracious duty. But this committee has a record for bringing in bills for increasing salaries. I remember it recommended the increase of the salary of the secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission from \$5,000 to \$7,500. It was my privilege to oppose that amendment, and the House voted that to remain at \$5,000.

But here, gentlemen, to raise the salary of these inspectors at one fell swoop \$1,200, to raise them \$1,000 more than is being paid for the same character of work in private employment, is, I think, going away beyond what the conditions demand.

These inspectors are Government employees. The position that the Committee on Appropriations has taken—and I think it should be followed by the Congress—is that as to the higher-priced employees there should be no increases during the war; that every Government employee must recognize that we are at war, that he must contribute his part toward bearing the burden of the Government. I, for one, do not want an employee of the Government to work for less than his services to the Government are worth. But these men are given a tenure for life, and that is a great asset, unquestionably, under Government employment. We know why men in the departments are holding on to their positions when they can get more in private employment. It is because they have the security of position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. STAFFORD. These men, having the security of their positions and upon the recommendation of the executive heads, request an increase. If you will study the recommendations of the department heads in the Book of Estimates you will find that they invariably recommend increases of its higher-paid officials, but the Committee on Appropriations has declined to follow their recommendations in this war period. We realize that if we once adopt that policy it will result in the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars, and we could not afford in these times to adopt that policy.

This bill went through the last Congress with the salaries of these division inspectors placed at \$2,400. The proponents

point to the high cost of living. True, the cost of living has even gone up since that bill was passed. But that is no reason for fixing salaries permanently on abnormal conditions of the present. When you analyze this bill you can not justify the extraordinary increase of these men's salaries from \$1,800 to \$3,000. The hearings do not justify it. The established policy of Congress does not justify it. I favor some reasonable increase to these men if they are not receiving a proper salary, but I do not believe we are justified in granting them at one fell swoop, as I said before, an increase of \$1,200.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. How does that increase, that you say amounts to \$3,750—that is, the increased salary and per diem—compare with the increase allowed by the wage board to other employees in their recent report?

Mr. STAFFORD. I must confess that I have not had time to examine the report of the wage board. I assume that that wage report was founded on the scale of wages being paid in private employment. I have taken the hearings and have read extracts to gentlemen, which I repeat again from the testimony on this bill, showing that general boiler inspectors receive from \$175 to \$225 per month with expense accounts, and that makes a salary of \$2,700 a year. But these men are going to receive \$3,700, when you take into consideration the fact that one-half of the per diem is pure salary. That is what you are doing here. Can you justify it in these strained conditions that prevail in the finances of the country? I do not think you can.

But I did not rise for the purpose of disparaging the great work these men were doing. As I said before, this bill had my support when it was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the Sixty-first Congress. But we should not run wild just because it has the indorsement of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers or because it has the recommendation of one of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, a few years ago Congress passed what is known as the safety-appliance law, to promote the safety of employees and the traveling public on our railroads. Now, we all know the great benefits that the American people and the employees of the railroads have derived from the passage of that law. It was necessary to have some inspectors to enforce the safety-appliance law, and we have before us for consideration at this time a bill increasing the salaries of the locomotive-boiler inspectors.

The locomotive-boiler inspectors not only inspect the locomotive boilers, but they have charge of the inspection of the entire locomotive. There are many things about a locomotive which are dangerous to the traveling public and to the railroad employees besides the boilers. These inspectors see to it that the air brakes and the apparatus that furnishes the air on the locomotive are all in good working order. They see to it that the piston packing is in good shape. During the cold weather if the locomotives have a leak in a piston packing the steam escapes in such a way that it obstructs the vision of the locomotive engineer and makes it impossible for him to see the signals. That makes it dangerous not only to the traveling public but to the employees themselves.

I speak from my own personal experience as to what these inspectors have done. Before this law was passed and these inspectors were placed in these positions the railroad engineer had no option in the matter. If the roundhouse foreman told him to take a certain engine out, whether it was in good condition or not, he had to take that locomotive out on the road, to the detriment not only of himself, but to the danger of the traveling public.

These inspectors are all very high-class men. They are men of mechanical minds, men who have been trained all their lives around the locomotive shops in repair work and in rebuilding locomotives, and I believe that they ought to be granted an increase of salary, because they are men of high caliber.

I was a little surprised to hear my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] say that he was given to understand that these men put in about half of their time at home and thereby saved this \$4 per diem which they received for traveling expenses. The fact is that we have only 50 locomotive-boiler inspectors throughout the entire United States, and at this time we have about 73,000 locomotives; or, in other words, each one of these locomotive-boiler inspectors will have from 1,200 to 1,500 locomotives to inspect.

Now, it seems to me that when an inspector has from 1,200 to 1,500 locomotives to inspect he can not put in very much time at home. It may be, around a large industrial center like the city of Chicago or Pittsburgh or New York, where they have a good many locomotives in there all the time, that these inspectors at these special points may have the privilege of being at home quite often. But how about the inspectors who travel all over the United States? I believe I speak correctly when I say that for some of the States they have not more than one inspector. That inspector has to travel all over the State. He has to ride night and day. He has to jump from this place to that and catch these locomotives on the road and give them their inspection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman mean to convey the impression to the House that these locomotive inspectors make the inspection of the locomotive while it is in operation?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Absolutely so.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit me, I wish to say that the testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, when this inspection measure was originally proposed, back in 1910, was to the effect that the only way you could inspect a locomotive boiler was to get inside and determine whether it would stand the water test. Of course, I can understand that as far as the appurtenances of the boiler are concerned, like the water gauges and stopcocks and the like, they could be inspected while the locomotive was in use, but to determine whether the boiler is fit for use they have to apply the water test to it when it is not in motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] has expired.

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The gentleman from Wisconsin is not informed at all in regard to the duties of these locomotive boiler inspectors. These Government inspectors do not crawl into the boiler at all. That physical inspection is done by the engine-house foreman, and after he makes this inspection it is sworn to in an affidavit. It is the duty of these United States district inspectors to see to it that these regular inspections of the boiler are made every 2 weeks or every 30 days. It is the duty of the inspector to travel on the road and catch the locomotive out on the road. How is he going to tell whether a piston packing is blowing or not if the locomotive is not working? He can not tell whether a piston packing is blowing if the locomotive is standing still, because when it is standing still it is not using any steam. How can he tell whether the gauge cocks are in good working order or not unless he catches the locomotive out on the road when it is working? How can he tell whether the water glass is in good condition or not, and whether the water is working freely up and down in the glass unless he inspects the engine out on the road? I speak from my own personal experience regarding their work. I have had them come to locomotives which I have been driving time and again, and stop me right in the yard or on the road and examine the locomotive from one end to the other. The position of these inspectors is very responsible, and I say they ought to be granted an increase in salary, because they are high-class men. The traveling public of the United States depend upon these locomotive inspectors to a great extent for the safety of their lives and their well-being when they are traveling over our railroads. I can state personally that it has been a godsend and a blessing to the American railway employees to have these men inspect their locomotives. I trust that the House will pass this bill. I believe it is fair and just, and I believe these men ought to be granted this increase which they are asking for. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I quite agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], that it is not a pleasant task to undertake the duty of holding down the constant increases of salaries in this House. I assure every gentleman present that it is not a pleasant duty upon my part. I would rather make an individual in this world feel better, if only for a moment, and have him say something kind about me, than to make him feel badly and say something ill of me. I know that the easiest way out of these things, as far as a Member is concerned, is simply to swallow everything—hook, line, and bait—no matter what is put up to us, never criticize it, never raise any question about it, but vote for it, and in that way we will get along best back home.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a little evidence, to my mind, of what the Congress of the United States has got to come to. This eternal expenditure of money has got to stop somewhere. I

know if a man raises that question on the floor of the House he is met instantly by the argument that we are the richest Nation upon the earth; that we should not even pause a moment to criticize expenditures in any way whatever, but that we should let these things go, whatever they may be. I am not sure but that the system we have in the formation of committees has brought upon this House the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and I am sure that we have got to go to a budget system in Congress. I doubt very much whether we will ever be able to do it until both parties incorporate that as a plank in their platforms and elect Members of Congress who will vote for a budget when they come here. If you raise the question of a budget on the floor of the House, immediately you strike some chairman of a committee reporting appropriations, and immediately you begin to strike Members of the House who are opposed to a budget system because they do not want to lose their positions on an important appropriating committee of which they have been members for many years. My idea is that we have got to come not only to a budget system, so far as appropriations are concerned, but to a budget system of raising revenue and make the appropriations by the same identical committee. It is no use to say we can not do it; that our form of government will not submit to it, because it will, and we can do it if we resolutely set our heads to accomplish that end.

Now, a word about this bill. These men are good men. There is no question about that. But I earnestly ask you if you do not feel that this increase of salaries is too much? The assistant secretaries of the various departments of the Government get only \$5,000 a year. In all sincerity, do you not believe that if this chief inspector had an increase of \$500 a year, making him a total of \$4,500 per year, that would be enough for him; and do you not think that when you increase the salaries of these assistant inspectors from \$3,000 to \$4,000 a year that is too much of an increase? And to increase the salaries of all these 50 inspectors from \$1,800 a year to \$3,000 a year, in my opinion, is an increase which is out of all proportion.

Now, what is the argument used here by the gentlemen bringing this bill on the floor of the House to justify these increases. They say that a few inspectors are quitting their line of work and going into a similar line in private life. Are we to be compelled to pay a salary so that no man will quit a Government position and return to private life; and if so, where is the line going to be drawn? To turn the situation around, thousands upon thousands of men are leaving private life and going into public life to-day. It merely means a shifting or changing of positions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ESCH. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. COX. I undertake to say that this very minute there are not less than 1,000 applications now at the Interstate Commerce Commission for these \$1,800 positions. Three years ago a man wanted to stand a civil-service examination for one of these positions, and I went down to look the matter up. If I recollect correctly, there were upward of 1,100 applicants ahead of him. I dare say that you will find approximately that number there to-day—1,100 men qualified to stand a civil-service examination, willing and anxious to get these jobs at \$1,800 a year. But two have resigned, and in order to keep the force intact we must raise the salaries to \$3,000 a year!

Now, take the \$4 per diem; that is too much. We ought not to pay these inspectors or any other inspectors, I care not in what department they may work, \$4 a day when they are at home, eat at their own table, and sleeping in their own beds. How do you account for it? Is it right?

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman has been a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads a long while.

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. How is it with post-office inspectors?

Mr. COX. They get \$3 a day.

Mr. ESCH. For every day in the year and while absent?

Mr. COX. Two thousand or twenty-two hundred are allowed every day in the year.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, I believe the gentleman is in error. That was the condition until an amendment was placed in the bill reported in the Fifty-sixth Congress. When that abuse was called to the attention of the committee, back in 1904, it was remedied so that they would be only entitled to a per diem when away from the designated place.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT].

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, of course we all admire and oftentimes applaud those who are generally known as the watchdogs of the Treasury, but very frequently their bark is more potent than their bite; and what is also essentially true, they oftentimes bite the wrong individual, at the wrong time, and in the wrong place. [Laughter.]

As illustrative of this fact, this bill in itself is an exemplification. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER], who rose from the engine cab to become a Congressman, very fully explained the nature and class of duties that these men as district inspectors are obliged to perform. I would not for one moment attempt to enlarge on that subject. But let me give to this House some knowledge of these subjects which I myself had in my earlier days, when I, too, served on the railroad.

The railroad inspector of engines and boilers and mechanical parts of the engines—in other words, the man who has charge of the motive power of a train—has in his keeping the life and safety of every individual on that train—of the conductor and brakeman, the engineer and fireman, and as well as every man who pays fare on the train—and, therefore, initially it is true that the safety of the entire traveling public as well as the safety of the employees of the railroad company is dependent in a large measure on the efficiency of this inspection. This inspection is what we call district inspection by 50 employees of the Government. It is their duty to see that the inspection is performed by the railroad inspectors. In other words, the engine in the roundhouse is taken out by the man who is called the jockey or hostler. The jockey gets the engine and takes it to the place where the engineer gets possession of it. Prior to the initiation of this system the jockey took the engine which the foreman gave him, gave it to the engineer, and the engineer was obliged to run it whether it was faulty or perfect at the time he took it. The consequence was his safety and life was imperiled, and the safety and life of every individual on the train.

The Government took hold of the matter and said, "We will appoint our inspectors to see whether the inspection is performed," and now no engine can be taken out of the roundhouse unless it is subject to Government inspection once in 30 days.

Now, talking about the salaries my friend has spoken of, there is not a railroad conductor running on a through line that is not receiving at least \$150 a month. He is paid by the trip. There is not an engineer in a cab to-day, running either on a freight train or a through passenger train, that is not receiving at least \$200 a month on the trip route. The Government has proposed within a few short hours, or a few short days, that the salaries or compensation of these men, to wit, the engineers, conductors, firemen, and brakemen, shall be increased 25 per cent. What does that mean? If a conductor gets \$150 a month, or \$1,800 a year, and under Government regulations he gets 25 per cent more, he will get \$2,250. An engineer getting \$200 a month and an increase of 25 per cent will get \$600 in addition, or \$3,000 a year. A conductor gets \$2,250, and yet these men do not have one iota of the responsibility of the man who is inspector of the motive power that moves the train.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DEWALT. Just one minute to answer the question.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire upon what authority the gentleman states that locomotive engineers on an average are paid \$200 a month?

Mr. DEWALT. They receive more than that on an average. They are paid by the trip.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am told upon reliable authority by the gentleman to whom the gentleman from Pennsylvania paid a compliment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is away wrong in his figures.

Mr. DEWALT. There is not a locomotive engineer to-day on a through train, or even on a freight train, that is not paid by the trip, and their average is more than \$4 to \$5 a day, and I know whereof I speak.

Mr. STAFFORD. Four dollars to five dollars a day would not be \$200 a month.

Mr. DEWALT. No; but they are paid by the trip, and they make more than that by overtime very frequently. One word more and I have concluded. If, then, the trackmen, the conductors, and the engineers who have charge of the motive power which is handed over to them after inspection should be given this raise, I ask why, in the name of common sense, should not these men who are experts and who know the construction of an

engine and who are skilled in this particular line of duty be given a commensurate rate, and that, it seems to me, is the end of the argument.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting therein a statement from Gen. E. H. Crowder, Provost Marshal General, as to what has been accomplished by the draft law up to date.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, does that in any way relate to the "work or fight" order?

Mr. DENT. No.

Mr. COX. I was in hopes that it would cover that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, the next bill which I expect to call up is the lighthouse bill, and I have been exceedingly anxious to get through the discussion on this bill so as to consider that bill, for it is a very important measure. I have yielded to the gentlemen who understand the provisions of this bill in detail, so that they could answer such questions better than I could. I have nothing to say in reply to the perennial criticism always heard when an attempt is made to do dollar and cent justice to worthy Government employees to the effect that what is attempted in that direction is extravagant and wasteful expenditures. This is a life-saving service. These men do a most unwelcome duty. They have to inspect and give orders, doing that which is necessary for some one to do in the interest of public safety, and in my opinion the dollars to be spent in giving fair compensation should not be considered for a moment. They are in a way performing a military service at this time.

They are saving human life, they are making the travel of 100,000,000 people safer than it otherwise would be. They are saving to the property owners themselves millions of dollars by not permitting the railroads to use inefficient and dangerous equipment, but every time we raise the question here as between dollars and human life, between profits and human safety, someone is ready to fight it and make complaints about it being a costly expenditure. I think I personally know something about the expense of living at this time. A great proportion of these men have to live in towns and cities where necessary expenses are very high. They are justly entitled to this meager increase in this bill. They accepted this service patriotically and uncomplainingly at the beginning in order to install the service. They have shown their mettle, they have shown what they are worth, and when it is demonstrated that human life has been saved, that accidents have been reduced 50 per cent or more, we should not be deterred with arguments in regard to the little amount of money involved, in increasing the compensation of 53 men who in a way have charge of the life and the safety of every passenger and every employee upon the trains on all the railroads in the United States, and who are protecting the property of the owners of the railroads, which according to their own statements amounts to \$20,000,000,000 in value. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the act entitled 'An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto,' approved February 17, 1911, as amended, be, and is hereby, amended as follows:

"Amend section 3 so as to provide that the salary of the chief inspector shall be \$5,000 per year; the salary of each assistant inspector shall be \$4,000 per year.

"Amend section 4 so as to provide that the salary of each district inspector shall be \$3,000 per year."

"SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as amending, altering, or repealing any of the other provisions of said sections."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 19, after the period, insert the following:

"Provided, That no per diem shall be allowed an inspector except when in the field away from his home."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that amendment ought to be incorporated in this bill. I can not understand, for the life of me, and I never will understand, why a man who is drawing a salary, or who will draw a salary if it becomes a law, of \$3,000 should be paid \$4 per day when he is staying at

home, eating at his own table, sleeping in his own bed, occupying his own house. There is a reason, of course, why you should pay an inspector traveling around away from home, because he is at some extra expense over what he would be if he were at home. I undertake to say that this \$4 per diem is more than will be necessary to pay any of these inspectors, and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] well stated a while ago, there will be at least 25 per cent, or even 50 per cent, of the per diem actually saved as salary at the end of each year by the inspector because he will not use it.

There are hundreds—yes, there are thousands—of cities in the United States to-day where the inspector or any other man, for that matter, can go and get a room, board, and lodging for \$3 per day. There are hundreds of places in the United States to-day where an inspector or any other man can go and get a room and lodging for \$2.50 a day. I recall, and I repeat on the floor of this House, that when Mr. WEEKS, of Massachusetts, was chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, down to that time the post-office inspectors had been paid \$4 per diem. It was at the request of the Post Office Committee that the Post Office Department took that question up with its inspectors. It put the inspectors on an actual expense basis for a period of three months. That proved that inspectors could live on \$3 per day instead of \$4. And that showed another thing, that by reducing the per diem from \$4 to \$3 per diem upon 2,200 inspectors it saved the Government upward of \$60,000 per year. Now, gentlemen, why pay a man a per diem when he is at home, especially when you propose to increase the salary of that man from \$1,800 to \$3,000 per year, when you are giving an increase of salary of 75 per cent? Is it fair to the Treasury that you deliberately take out of the Treasury of the United States money and pay him while he is sitting around home and at his own fireside? But my friend from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] says that when there is a question coming up here of saving human life that he is not going to pay any attention to any man who cries or talks about economy. There is a time coming when every Member of this House will pay attention to economy, and that time is not very far distant.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Is there any department of the Government where a per diem is paid, outside of the Post Office Department, where the per diem is not throughout the year?

Mr. COX. I do not know.

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and it comes within the purview of that committee.

Mr. COX. I have been a member of that committee only for the last three months.

Mr. ESCH. I should not think there would be any reason to make any discrimination against the inspectors if all the other branches of the Government allow—

Mr. COX. I will say to the gentleman that if there be any other per diem inspectors in any other branch of the Government they ought not to be paid a per diem while they are at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. May I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COX. And if they are being paid a per diem while at home it is wrong, and two wrongs never make a right. If that is wrong, this is wrong, and if this is wrong it ought to be cut out. I do not take kindly to the argument at all that perchance because some other department is doing the same thing that another department should be given the same right. The fundamental question is, Is the other department right, is the other department on a sound basis, is the other department only paying actual travel or living expenses? If so, then that is all this department ought to have. If the other departments are paying more than the expenses, it is no right, it is no foundation, it is no reason why these men should have it. Now, I know this only saves a few dollars, not much, but it is a little. The principle is worth more than the money saved by it, and besides does any Member want to take the position that a man, unless he is paid an exorbitant salary and paid \$4 per diem when he is at home, that that man will not look after the business of the traveling public as carefully as one receiving that increase of salary? Do you want to put it on that ground? Do you want to put it on that theory, you men who advocate this proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a statement which perhaps will relieve the situation somewhat. Mr. McManamy

has been just called up and asked about this per diem, and it is only paid when the inspector is actually on duty traveling and away from home.

Mr. COX. Then ought not the committee to accept my amendment?

Mr. SIMS. Why does the gentleman want it? You do not need it.

Mr. COX. What is the objection to it?

Mr. SIMS. It looks in the direction of a dollar, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman opposed to saving a dollar?

Mr. SIMS. It does not save a dollar, because they do not get it.

Mr. COX. It absolutely saves dollars in that it prevents an inspector from being paid any expenses except in the field.

Mr. SIMS. They only get paid for traveling, and their vouchers have to be approved.

Mr. COX. Then what objection can there be to the amendment?

Mr. SIMS. It is absolutely useless. It has served the gentleman to make a good speech, but there is no use in the amendment, because they only get it when they are on actual duty away from home.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana ought to prevail because there is no necessity for it. In the first place I am quite certain these men only get paid their per diem allowance when on the road.

Mr. SIMS. That is right.

Mr. MADDEN. But it is quite true they are on the road nearly all the time. Now, the men employed in this service must be first-class mechanics. They have got to understand the mechanism of all locomotives, boilers, and everything connected with them, and all its strong parts and weak parts, everything connected with it in order that they may be able to determine upon inspection exactly whether it is safe or not. The boiler inspector is obliged to go into the fire box. He is obliged to find out whether the crown sheet of the boiler is in perfect order or not; he is obliged to find out whether the boiler is supplied with a soft plug so that if the water should run low the boiler will not blow up; he is obliged to find out whether the crown sheet is in such shape as it ought to be, whether the flues are in such shape as will justify their continuance in the boiler; what pressure the boiler should carry with safety; what weak spots should be strengthened by repairs; where the boiler needs patching; whether patching should be permitted or whether a new boiler should be supplied.

He must know exactly what to do and when and where to do it. He is on the road for the purpose of finding out, and I presume to say that he will not be home one day a week.

These district boiler inspectors are men who have to go from place to place to ascertain the condition of the boilers that are running on the railroads in order that they may be able to furnish information to the railroad companies which will enable them to supply such repairs as will make the boiler safe. Every well-regulated business institution has its boilers inspected regularly, whether there is any law requiring the inspection of boilers by expert boiler inspectors or not, and the business concern that has the care of its men who are operating these boilers at heart will have the insurance companies that carry the insurance on the boilers make periodical investigation and inspection of the boilers, and that will furnish them information that will enable them to know where the weak spots in the boilers are. This is no sinecure of a job. I happen to know, and have visited the boilers with the inspectors at all hours of the night and have gone into the boilers with them. I know the work they have to do. And the compensation they receive for the work performed, no matter how large that compensation is, is not excessive. And to say that they should go out and travel over the road and go into the roundhouses throughout their district and not be paid for their cost of living while they are away is not right. And I am quite sure they are never paid except when they are away on duty.

And so far as the compensation itself is concerned, although it seems like a large increase over what they are now getting, it is not more than adequate. And the chief inspector certainly ought to be a man qualified to earn \$5,000 a year in his calling, and he ought to get it, and would get it if he was engaged in private employment.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I would like to say that the chief inspector has had more duties placed upon him since the Government took over the railroads. He has charge of the locomotives of the United States.

Mr. MADDEN. Whether he has or not, he had an onerous job as it was, and one that required technical skill. He must be educated in his calling or he could not have performed the functions of the employment. And a man who is required to have technical education and is charged with the responsibility that the chief inspector has imposed upon him ought to be adequately recompensed for the work he does. And I hope that not only the compensation provided for in the bill will be allowed, but that the allowance for expenses of the district inspectors will be allowed without change.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the House with any argument on this proposition, which is a plain, straightforward business proposition; and I sympathize with the patriotic motives of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] to save as far as possible any wrongful encroachment upon the Treasury of the United States. I think that should be done in all bills, and I do not think the laboring men of the country will object to anything like that. But I do believe that the committee that originally framed the bill—not this amendment, but the original law—and Congress, when it enacted the law, have better provided for the safety of the Treasury in this regard than is provided by the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana. And, if you will permit me, I would like to read what the law is now:

Each inspector shall receive a salary of \$1,800 per year and his traveling expenses while engaged in the performance of his duty. He shall receive in addition thereto an allowance for office rent, stationery, and clerical assistance, to be fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but not to exceed in the case of any district inspector \$600 per year.

I believe that that covers the points in the case. A man under that could not, while he was sleeping at home in his own bed, get any per diem. In fact, the bill does not provide any per diem. It is a question of getting his traveling expenses while he is actually in the performance of his duty. And I think the law is pretty well framed as it is.

And there is another thing that you should keep in mind, namely, that this \$600 is the limit for expenses, and for my part, while I believe in economy, I also believe in efficiency, and there are some places where it is almost impossible for these inspectors in large cities to maintain an office on the amount which we provide here as a limit.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DECKER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I believe it is a fact that these inspectors have to fill out an itemized statement of every dollar of expense they incur while traveling.

Mr. DECKER. I believe, gentlemen of the committee, that it would be well to vote down the amendment. The committee of this House that had the framing of the original bill and also the amendment has tried to keep in mind the welfare of the Treasury and also the safety of the people of the United States. I think it is pretty well written as it is; and much better, I think, than the extemporaneous amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. COX. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 5, yeas 21.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, line 19, strike out the figures "\$3,000" and insert "\$2,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cox: Page 2, line 19, strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$2,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. COX. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 6, yeas 23.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill as amended to the House, with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LINTHICUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that

committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10297) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SIMS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. MOON. To present the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill, for printing under the rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads state whether he intends to call the report up for consideration to-morrow?

Mr. MOON. I hope so. I do not know whether we shall be able to do so or not, but I will be glad to do so if I can.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman if it is a complete agreement?

Mr. MOON. No, sir; it is not a complete agreement.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Conference report on the bill (H. R. 7237) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed under the rule.

Following are the conference report and accompanying statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 627).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7237) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 22, 26, and 60.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 51, 55, 56, 61, 62, 64, and 65, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 2 of the bill, in line 12, after the word "all," insert "including increases hereinafter provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 3 of the bill, in line 4, after the word "all," insert "including increases hereinafter provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 5 of the bill, in line 4, after the word "all," insert "including increases hereinafter provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 10 of the bill, in line 23, after the word "all," insert "including increases hereinafter provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11 of the bill, in line 14, after the word "all," insert "including in-

creases hereinafter provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11 of the bill, in line 17, after the word "all," insert "including increases hereinafter provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 13 of the bill, in line 23 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "\$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$300,000"; and in line 25 strike out the word "the" where it first appears and insert in lieu thereof the word "this"; and in the same line strike out "contemplated by the appropriation title," so that the amendment as amended will read as follows: "Provided, That not to exceed \$300,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the payment of this service during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 14 of the bill, in line 13, strike out the word "the" where it first appears and insert in lieu thereof the word "this," and in the same line strike out the words "contemplated by the appropriation title," so that the amendment as amended will read as follows: "Provided, That not to exceed \$100,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the payment of this service during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 18 of the bill, in line 1 of the amendment proposed by the Senate, after the word "Winnepesaukee," insert the following: "from the post office at Laconia"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 19 of the bill, in line 22, after the word "all," insert "including increases hereinafter provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 22 of the bill, in line 25 of the matter proposed by the Senate, after the word "compensation," insert the word "thus"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$370,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "nor shall any of said sum be expended for star-route service for a patronage a major portion of which has been served by Rural Delivery Service, unless the services of a qualified rural carrier can not be secured"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided further, That on and after July 1, 1918, rural carriers assigned to horse-drawn vehicle routes on which daily service is performed shall receive \$24 per mile per annum for each mile said routes are in excess of 24 miles or major fraction thereof, based on actual mileage, and rural carriers assigned to horse-drawn vehicle routes on which triweekly service is performed shall receive \$12 per mile per annum for each mile said routes are in excess of 24 miles or major fraction thereof based on actual mileage: *Provided further*, That the pay of carriers who furnish and maintain their own motor vehicles and who serve routes not less than 50 miles in length

may be fixed at not exceeding \$2,160 per annum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Sec. 2. That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the annual salaries fixed by law for assistant postmasters at first and second class post offices and supervisory officials, whose compensation is \$2,200 and less per annum, shall be increased \$200, and those whose compensation is in excess of \$2,200 shall be increased 5 per cent; that clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall be divided into six grades, as follows: First grade, salary \$1,000; second grade, salary \$1,100; third grade, salary \$1,200; fourth grade, salary \$1,300; fifth grade, salary \$1,400; sixth grade, salary \$1,500. Clerks and carriers shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade: *Provided*, That on July 1, 1918, clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service who are in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, under the act of March 2, 1907, as amended, shall pass automatically from such grades and the salaries they receive thereunder to the new grades, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively, with the salaries provided for such grades in this act: *Provided further*, That the salaries of railway postal clerks shall be graded as follows: Grade 1 at \$1,100, grade 2 at \$1,200, grade 3 at \$1,300, grade 4 at \$1,400, grade 5 at \$1,500, grade 6 at \$1,600, grade 7 at \$1,700, grade 8 at \$1,800, grade 9 at \$1,900, grade 10 at \$2,000.

"The Postmaster General shall classify and fix the salaries of railway postal clerks, under such regulations as he may prescribe, in the grades provided by law; and for the purpose of organization and establishing maximum grades to which promotions may be made successively, as hereinafter provided, he shall classify railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, and transfer offices with reference to their character and importance in three classes, with salary grades as follows:

"Class A, \$1,100 to \$1,400; class B, \$1,100 to \$1,500; and class C, \$1,100 to \$1,700. He may assign to the offices of division superintendents and chief clerks such railway postal clerks as may be necessary, and fix their salaries within the grades provided by law without regard to the classification of railway post offices: *Provided*, That on July 1, 1918, railway postal clerks shall pass automatically from the grades they are in and the salaries they receive under the act of August 24, 1912, to the corresponding grade, with salaries provided for in this act: *Provided*, That the classifications and increases of salaries provided for in this section shall not be continued beyond the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919: *Provided further*, That the salary of clerks, carriers and railway postal clerks shall be increased during the fiscal year 1919, not more than \$200: *Provided further*, That the classifications herein provided for shall not become effective until July 1, 1918: *Provided further*, That the salaries of such other employees fixed by law or paid from lump-sum appropriations provided for in this act who receive \$800 per annum or less shall be increased 15 per cent per annum. Rural carriers assigned to horse-drawn vehicle routes now receiving a compensation of \$1,200 or less per annum, exclusive of mileage allowance for miles on routes over 24 miles in length, shall receive, in addition thereto, 20 per cent of the amount of such compensation. Such increases shall not apply to the special assistant to the Attorney General appropriated for in this act and to postmasters at offices of the first, second and third classes: *Provided further*, That postmasters of the fourth class shall receive the same compensation as now provided by law, except that they shall receive 100 per cent of the cancellations of the first \$80 or less per quarter: *Provided further*, That, if the compensation does not exceed \$50 for any one quarter, fourth-class postmasters shall be allowed an increase of 20 per cent of the compensation allowed under existing law: *Provided further*, That no office shall be advanced to third class by reason of the temporary increases herein provided: *Provided further*, That hereafter substitute, temporary, or auxiliary clerks and letter carriers at first and second class post offices shall be paid at the rate of 40 cents an hour: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees who receive a part of their pay from any outside sources under cooperative arrangement with the Post Office Department, or to employees who serve voluntarily or receive only a nominal compensation: *And provided further*, That the increased compensation, at the rate of 5 per cent and 10 per cent for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, shall not be computed as salary in construing this section. So much as may be necessary for the increases provided for in this act is hereby appropriated."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 32 of the bill, in lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "assistant postmasters and other supervisory employees"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 32 of the bill, in line 16, strike out the words "April sixth" and insert in lieu thereof "June thirtieth"; and in line 18 strike out the words "which bids were received" and insert in lieu thereof "contracts entered into"; and in line 19 strike out the words "to the declaration of the present war" and insert in lieu thereof "June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and seventeen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 34 of the bill, in line 2, in lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$300,000"; and in line 6, after the word "date," insert a period and strike out the remainder of the section; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 34 of the bill, in line 16, after the word "Department," insert "but suitable for the use of the Postal Service"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 35 of the bill, in line 5, after the word "positions," insert a period and strike out the remainder of the section; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 36 of the bill, in line 21, in lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23, relating to the purchase of the pneumatic mail-tube systems: The conferees have been unable to agree.

JOHN A. MOON,
THOS. M. BELL,
A. B. ROUSE,
MARTIN B. MADDEN,
HALVOR STEENERSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
THOS. W. HARDWICK,
CHAS. E. TOWNSEND,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7237) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of said amendments, as follows:

On amendments 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 27: These amendments relate to items of compensation for a stated number of employees at stipulated salaries, plus temporary increases for the next fiscal year, provided in amendment 52, and the language inserted is for the purpose of making plain the legislative intent which made it necessary to increase the amounts to be appropriated therefor.

On amendments 2, 3, 5, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 30, 37, 46, and 51: These amendments also relate to the temporary increases for the next fiscal year for postal employees whose compensation is appropriated for in lump-sum allowances. The increases inserted by the Senate amendments are necessary to provide for the temporary increases proposed.

On amendment 8: Amendment 8 amends present law to enable postal employees entitled to compensatory time for Sunday or holiday service, if they so elect, to accept pay for overtime in lieu of compensatory time. It is deemed that such legislation is wise and in the interest of good service, since many employees entitled to compensatory service within the week following prefer to work rather than take the time off.

On amendments 13 and 15: Amendments 13 and 15 make permanent law an identical amendment which has been repeated

in each appropriation bill for a number of years. These amendments will make unnecessary the repetition of the same language in future appropriation bills.

On amendment 14: Increasing the appropriation by \$300,000 is made necessary by the increased cost for rent, light, and fuel in first, second, and third class post offices.

On amendment 19: The amendment agreed to does not increase the appropriation, but makes available \$300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

On amendment 20: This amendment is merely clerical.

On amendment 21: Amendment 21 makes immediately available for the present fiscal year \$100,000 for mail messenger service.

On amendment 22: This amendment relates to postage on drop letters in the city of New York, from which the Senate conferees receded.

On amendment 24: Amendment 24 relates to the mail service on Lake Winnepesaukee, N. H. A similar item has been carried in a number of previous bills, which fixed the salary of the carrier because of the peculiar conditions attending the service.

On amendment 25: Amendment 25 is a change in language made necessary by the preceding amendment.

On amendment 28: The word "regular" is inserted so as to enable the department to employ temporary railway postal clerks during certain emergencies, and is inserted to make clearer the legislative intent.

On amendment 29: The increased amount is necessary because of additional demands upon the service provided for in this item.

On amendments 31 and 32: Amendment 31 is necessary because of an increase of \$10,000 in the appropriation provided for in amendment 32, made necessary upon the statement of the Postmaster General that the unusual conditions require the additional amounts and is in the interest of good service.

On amendment 33: This amendment requires the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix and determine fair and reasonable rates of compensation for the transportation of mail by urban and interurban electric railway common carriers, the same as is now the case with steam railways, and provides that after the rates are so fixed, pursuant to due notice and hearing, as is usually provided, it shall be unlawful for such carriers to refuse to perform the service at the rates so prescribed.

On amendment 34: Amendment 34 increases the appropriation for censorship of foreign mails made necessary because of the increased labor involved, and makes immediately available \$200,000 for that purpose.

On amendment 35: This amendment is intended to prevent duplication in the censorship of mails from the military forces connected with the American expeditionary force.

On amendment 36: Amendment 36 increases the appropriation for the manufacture of stamped envelopes and newspaper wrappers due to the increased demands upon the department.

On amendments 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42: These amendments relate to the supply of sundry material for the Postal Service throughout the country, and the increases provided are necessary because of the rapid growth of the service and the unusual demands for material and supplies.

On amendment 43: Amendment 43 makes available additional appropriations necessary for material and supplies, and for \$100,000 to be used by the Postmaster General for the installation and experiments with mail-distributing machines, particularly one that has been in operation in the Chicago post office and which is strongly commended by post-office officials in that city and by inspectors who have carefully investigated its possibilities and the economy of labor and expense.

On amendment 44: Amendment 44 changes the word "chairs" to "chains," to correct a clerical error.

On amendment 45: This amendment materially increasing the appropriation provided by the House is necessary to enable the department to purchase raw material and better equip the shops in the city of Washington for the manufacture of mail bags, mail containers, etc. Recent bids disclosed that the cost for this material in the open market has increased approximately 100 per cent. The Post Office Department believes that with additional funds they could manufacture them on their own account with economy to the Government.

On amendments 47 and 48: Amendments 47 and 48 modify a provision heretofore carried in each appropriation bill and provides that no part of the fund for inland transportation by star routes shall be expended for star-route service which is already served by Rural Delivery Service, unless the services of a qualified rural carrier can not be secured, and makes the provision permanent law.

On amendments 49 and 50: These amendments relate to the compensation for rural delivery carriers. In substance, they

include provisions contained in H. R. 9414, which has heretofore passed the House, and provide that rural carriers on horse-drawn vehicle routes shall receive \$24 per mile per annum for each mile said routes are in excess of 24 miles or major fraction thereof, based on actual mileage, the same as is now provided for routes in excess of 30 miles in length. On triweekly routes \$12 per mile per annum for each mile in excess of 24 miles is allowed the carrier. The present law respecting the compensation for motor-route carriers, who furnish their own automobiles, on routes not less than 50 miles in length is amended to increase their compensation from a maximum of \$1,800 to a maximum of \$2,160. The amendment by the Senate that a carrier may use such character of vehicle on horse-drawn routes as may be approved by the local postmaster is stricken out.

On amendment 52: Amendment 52 relates to temporary increases during the fiscal year for employees of the Postal Service, and, in substance, contains similar provisions to those contained in House bill 9414 recently passed by the House, except that the salaries of assistant postmasters and clerks and carriers in first and second class post offices, railway postal clerks from grade 1 to grade 10, inclusive, and supervisory officials, shall be increased not more than \$200 during the next fiscal year. Supervisory officials receiving in excess of \$2,200 receive an increase of 5 per cent. All other employees of the Postal Service whose compensation does not exceed \$800 per annum increased 20 per cent; those who receive from \$800 to \$1,500 per annum are increased 15 per cent. The salaries of rural carriers not in excess of \$1,200 are increased 20 per cent. No increases are provided for postmasters at first, second, and third class offices, but postmasters of the fourth class are allowed an additional increase of 100 per cent on cancellations up to \$80 per quarter instead of \$50 as at present, except that those whose compensation does not exceed \$50 per quarter are increased 20 per cent. Provision is made, however, that such temporary increases shall not have the effect of advancing the office to third class. The provision relating to advance in grades of clerks and carriers and railway postal clerks is included, but limited to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919. Provision is also made that substitute, temporary, and auxiliary clerks and carriers shall be paid at the rate of 40 cents per hour instead of 35 cents and 40 cents as at present, making the rate uniform.

On amendment 53: Amendment 53 extends to watchmen, messengers, and laborers in first and second class post offices and to railway postal clerks assigned to terminal railway post offices and transfer clerks the privileges of the 8 in 10 hour law, and also extends to railway postal clerks assigned to terminal railway post offices and transfer offices the privileges of compensatory time as now provided for clerks and carriers who work under the same conditions. The provision in the amendment extending compensatory time to assistant postmasters and supervisory employees is stricken out.

On amendment 54: Amendment 54 lodges with the Postmaster General the authority to investigate conditions arising from contracts on star route, screen wagon, and other vehicle service, and contracts for envelopes, blanks, and blank books and the Official Postal Guide entered into prior to June 30, 1917, with a view to determining whether or not any adjustment should be made in the contracts due to the increased cost for materials or services because of the war and whether the facts disclose the necessity to adjust the same for materials or services to be furnished after the approval of this act. With the consent of the contractor and his bondsmen the Postmaster General may cancel such contracts.

On amendment 55: Amendment 55 makes effective to certain employees in the Post Office Department the 5 and 10 per cent increase provided in the present appropriation bill which by reason of construction is denied them and is identical with a similar provision which has heretofore passed the House.

On amendment 56: Amendment 56 permits the Postmaster General to accept liberty bonds in lieu of corporate or personal surety for contractors, officers, and employees in the Postal Service and is identical with a similar provision which has heretofore passed the House.

On amendment 57: Amendment 57 relates to the same subject matter contained in H. R. 9414, which has heretofore passed the House, and permits experimentation by the Postmaster General in the operation of motor-vehicle truck routes in the vicinity of such cities as he may select. The sum of \$300,000 is made available out of unexpended appropriations for the Postal Service for the purpose of such experimentation, and direction is given that results shall be reported to Congress.

On amendment 58: Amendment 58 is almost identical with a similar provision in H. R. 9414, which has heretofore passed the House, and permits the Secretary of War to turn over to the Postmaster General without charge such aeroplanes and auto-

mobiles, or parts thereof, as are unsuitable for the War Department but suitable for the Postal Service.

On amendment 59: Amendment 59 authorizes employees and substitute employees of the Postal Service who enter the military or naval service to be restored after their honorable discharge from such service to the positions which they formerly occupied in the Postal Service at the salary to which they would have been promoted provided they are physically and mentally qualified. The provision in the Senate amendment which permitted members of the immediate family of such employee, or others connected with the expeditionary forces in Europe, to mail certain packages is stricken out.

On amendment 60: Amendment 60 proposed by the Senate is stricken out.

On amendment 61: Amendment 61 permits the Postmaster General to adjust claims of postmasters for loss by fire, burglary, or other cause, of war-savings stamps and thrift stamps, etc., which under the law they are required to keep on hand.

On amendment 62: Amendment 62 repeals existing law authorizing the payment of \$5 to postmasters for each recruit secured and accepted in the Army, Navy, or Marine service.

On amendments 63 and 64: Amendments 63 and 64 are the same as sections 9 and 10 of H. R. 9414, which has heretofore passed the House, increasing the amount any one person may deposit in a postal savings bank from \$1,000 with interest and \$1,000 without interest as provided under present law to \$2,500 with interest. The provision as passed the House was for \$3,000 with interest.

Amendment 64 permits the purchase of postal savings stamps in denominations of 10 cents to be affixed to a card and when it amounts to \$1 may be deposited as a postal savings account or redeemed in cash.

On amendment 65: Amendment 65 is a clerical one made necessary by the addition of certain sections to the bill.

On amendment 23: Amendment 23 relates to the purchase of the pneumatic-tube mail service. The conferees have been unable to agree respecting the provisions of this amendment.

JOHN A. MOON,
THOS. M. BELL,
A. B. ROUSE,
MARTIN B. MADDEN,
HALVOR STEENERSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Merely for the information of the Members interested, is the pneumatic-tube service purchase agreed to by the conferees or disagreed to?

Mr. MOON. No, sir; it is not agreed to; and I hope, in the interest of justice, it never can be. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The point is to have the announcement made, so that the Members who differ with the gentleman might be here.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION IN LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I call up House bill 11284.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11284) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill, with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] in the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11284, with Mr. Cox in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11284, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS], who reported the bill and has charge of it.

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is very similar to previous lighthouse bills that have passed the House. It

differs from former legislation only in one or two particulars, and perhaps I ought to refer briefly to those changes.

I desire to call attention first to section 6 of the bill, commonly known as the retirement provision. Section 6 provides—

That hereafter all officers and employees engaged in the field service or on vessels of the Lighthouse Service, except persons continuously employed in district offices or shops, who shall have reached the age of 65 years, after having been 30 years in the active service of the Government, may at their option be retired from further performance of duty; and all such officers and employees who shall have reached the age of 70 years shall be compulsorily retired from further performance of duty: *Provided*, That the annual compensation of persons so retired shall be a sum equal to one-fortieth of the average annual pay received for the last five years of service for each year of active service in the Lighthouse Service or in a department or branch of the Government having a retirement system, not to exceed in any case thirty-fortieths of such average annual pay received: *Provided further*, That such retirement pay shall not include any amount on account of subsistence or other allowance.

Gentlemen of the committee will recall that in the Sixty-third Congress the Revenue-Cutter Service and the Life-Saving Service were consolidated under the name of the Coast Guard. At that time men in the Revenue-Cutter Service were already enjoying the advantages of a retirement law, and by the act consolidating the two branches of the service the benefits of the retirement provision were extended to the men in the Life-Saving Service. By section 6 of this bill we attempt to place the men in the Lighthouse Service on an equality with the men in the Coast Guard.

This bill provides in substance for retirement of employees at the ages specified in section 6 at 75 per cent of their former salary. That works out in this way: A man who has received a salary of \$800 for the past five years will get thirty-fortieths of the salary upon retirement, or \$600. If he is now receiving a salary of \$600 per annum, he will upon retirement receive thirty-fortieths of that sum, or \$450.

Now as to the number of men who will be affected by this retirement provision—

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOREMUS. Certainly.

Mr. LONDON. On page 4, line 21, I find the expression "one-fortieth of the average pay."

Mr. DOREMUS. For each year of service.

Mr. LONDON. I did not understand the meaning of that.

Mr. DOREMUS. If he served 30 years he will get thirty-fortieths of his former pay. There are at present in the Lighthouse Service 133 men who would be affected by the retirement provision.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOREMUS. I will be glad to.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there a maximum period of service required before he can be retired?

Mr. DOREMUS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the maximum, and what is the minimum?

Mr. DOREMUS. If the employee has reached the age of 65 years and has seen 30 years of continuous service he may be retired at his option. If he has reached the age of 70 years he will be compelled to retire.

Mr. MADDEN. I know; but how many years of service must he have before he can be retired on age?

Mr. DOREMUS. If he reaches the age of 70 there is no provision as to length of service. If he reaches the age of 65 he must have had 30 years of service in order to be retired.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOREMUS. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. I take it from reading this bill that there is no provision for retirement except for the age limit. In other words, there is no provision similar to the Coast Guard provision, by which a retiring board may retire a man for physical disabilities. He must reach a certain age before he can get the benefit of this retirement act?

Mr. DOREMUS. That is correct.

Mr. HICKS. Did the committee consider the idea of having in this bill a provision similar to the provision in the Coast Guard law providing for retirement for disability?

Mr. DOREMUS. My recollection is that that matter was not discussed by the committee or recommended by the department.

Mr. HICKS. I see that the retirement age is 65. In the Army it is 64 and 62. Just why was the differential made between the two services?

Mr. DOREMUS. We retained the years specified in section 6 on the recommendation of the Secretary of Commerce and of the Commissioner of Lighthouses, who, of course, are familiar with the men in the service, who know their ages and are better qualified than we are to pass upon the question of when the retirement provision should go into effect.

Mr. LONDON. Coming back to the expression "one-fortieth," on page 4, line 21, I was misled by the language of that section, and upon rereading it I find it is extremely difficult to get at the real meaning of that proviso, which reads:

Provided, That the annual compensation of persons so retired shall be a sum equal to one-fortieth of the average annual pay received for the last five years of service for each year of active service in the Lighthouse Service or in a department or branch of the Government having a retirement system, not to exceed in any case thirty-fortieths of such average annual pay received.

What we really want to say is that the annual compensation shall be equal to the multiple of one-fortieth by the number of years of active service.

Mr. DOREMUS. If I understand the gentleman correctly, we have reached the same result. I think the gentleman will understand the matter when we put it in this way: For over 50 years the average annual salary of the lighthouse keepers has been \$600 per year. Now we will assume that one of these keepers has reached the age of 65 years and has seen 30 years of service. He is retired, and he gets thirty-fortieths of his previous pay. One-fortieth would be \$15, and thirty-fortieths would be \$450.

Mr. LONDON. I understand the computation, but I speak of the language "for each year of active service," in line 23, page 4, which is so far removed from the expression "the annual compensation of persons so retired shall be" that it is almost impossible to understand the meaning of the entire section.

Mr. DOREMUS. It works out very plainly. All you have to do is to get one-fortieth of the average salary for the last five years and multiply that by the years of service.

Mr. LONDON. What we mean is that the annual compensation will be a sum equal to one-fortieth of the average annual pay received for the last five years multiplied by the number of years of service.

Mr. DOREMUS. It means the same thing. Mr. Chairman, there are 50 men in the Lighthouse Service to-day who are 70 years old or more and who have seen 30 years or more of service. There are 27 who are 70 years old or more and have seen less than 30 years of service. There are 26 who are over 65 years of age and less than 70, with 30 years of service or more. There are 30 who are over 65 years of age and less than 70 years of age, with less than 30 years of service. That makes 133 men who will be affected by this proposed legislation if it becomes a law. Assuming that the average annual salary of these men is \$800 per annum, it is estimated that this provision will cost the Government approximately \$106,000 per year.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOREMUS. I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why was not the language in the Coast Guard retirement bill followed in this case? The allowance there on retirement is three-fourths of the annual pay, is it not?

Mr. DOREMUS. That is 75 per cent, and this works out identically the same with reference to the men who are retired after 30 years of service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This way of stating it is a little more involved, and I was wondering why you did not come at it directly.

Mr. DOREMUS. Under this bill it is possible that a man who has reached the age of 70 years and who has not seen 30 years of service will not get 75 per cent of his former pay.

Now, I desire to refer briefly to the reasons which actuated the committee in making this recommendation. We found that the work in which these men are engaged is in many instances of a very hazardous and dangerous character. We found that in 1917 there were 160 cases of the saving of life and property by these lighthouse keepers. Two hundred and thirteen employees were injured, and 12 lost their lives in this work.

We found ample precedents not only in our own laws but in the laws of Great Britain, France, Holland, Germany, New Zealand, Belgium, and Sweden for this legislation.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOREMUS. I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER. If this bill passes, it retires these lighthouse keepers on the pay fixed in the law?

Mr. DOREMUS. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. If this class of Government employees are retired on pay, is there any reason why all Government employees should not be retired on pay? Before the gentleman answers that question let me state that personally I am opposed to both propositions. I am opposed to retiring these lighthouse employees and all other Government employees on pay. They seek the employment. Let them stand the consequences.

Mr. DOREMUS. If my friend from Missouri will read section 6, he will find in it no precedent for extending retirement

with pay to all men in the Government service, because he will find it expressly excludes those who have been continuously employed in district offices or shops. It applies only to those who by reason of their employment are obliged to risk the hazards attendant upon the saving of life and property. The committee could see no material distinction between the character of service performed by these men and the service performed by men in the life-saving service and in the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Section 7 of the bill increases the salaries of the superintendents of lighthouses from \$2,400 to \$3,000 per annum. The Secretary of Commerce recommended that these salaries be placed at \$3,600. The committee, however, believed that \$3,000 would be fair and equitable as to these men. This would apply to all the superintendents except the one in New York City, whose salary is now fixed by law at \$3,600 per annum.

Section 8 makes the average pay of the lighthouse keepers \$700 per annum. When I state to the committee that the average annual salary of these men for over half a century has been \$600 a year, and that during all that time there has been no change whatever, I think I have stated a sufficient argument in favor of this small increase in their salaries.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOREMUS. I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ESCH. The actual average was only \$559 per year.

Mr. DOREMUS. I am glad to be corrected. My colleague on the committee states that, as a matter of fact, the average annual pay has been only \$559.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How long has that been the salary?

Mr. DOREMUS. For 51 years, without any change.

Mr. MERRITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOREMUS. I will.

Mr. MERRITT. Is the salary in addition to the living expenses?

Mr. DOREMUS. I neglected to say that there is a provision in the bill, section 3, which increases the amount allowed for rations per day from 30 cents to 45 cents. Forty-five cents is the amount now allowed in the Coast Guard. We propose to make it the same in the Lighthouse Service.

Mr. MERRITT. If a man has a family, he does not get any per diem for the members of that family?

Mr. DOREMUS. No; that is all he gets.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to two or three paragraphs of the bill which were not brought to the attention of the House by the gentleman from Michigan. Under the paragraph entitled "general service," on page 1 of the bill, we provide for an appropriation of \$760,000 for the construction, purchasing, and equipping of lighthouse tenders and light vessels to replace vessels worn out in the service in several districts. There are three vessels in the Lighthouse Service that are so old that it no longer pays the Government to repair them, and, in fact, their further employment by the Government in the Lighthouse Service is not justified. For instance, if this provision remains in, appropriating money for the construction of new light vessels, it will enable us to supplant the *John Rogers*, an old wooden side-wheeled vessel that was constructed as far back as 1883. It would permit us to replace the *Holly*, a wooden vessel and a side wheeler, built in 1881. It would also permit us to replace the *Jessamine*, a vessel 35 years old. I think that no argument is needed to convince the House of the necessity of making this appropriation for these replacements. The building program for the Lighthouse Service ought to be two vessels a year. There are now 119 vessels in the establishment, 58 tenders and 61 light vessels. Due to depreciation and hard service two of these vessels on an average ought to be scrapped a year. So unless we make the appropriation to restore these taken out of the service the service will be rendered ineffective.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I will.

Mr. WALSH. What type of vessel can be built for \$200,000; will it be the modern tender that the department is building or will it be a wooden craft?

Mr. ESCH. There will be no wooden craft; they will be modern steel vessels after the type that has been established by the Lighthouse Service itself. After years of experience they have developed their own type of vessel.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is aware that there is a great demand for steel and a great increase in the cost of shipbuilding. I would like to ask if the committee took these facts into consideration in fixing the sum at \$200,000.

Mr. ESCH. If the gentleman will notice in the bill we are considering, the \$200,000 is eliminated.

Mr. WALSH. I was following the gentleman's remarks from the report and I had not noticed that.

Mr. ESCH. We have changed the bill and made an omnibus provision of \$760,000 for vessels needed in the Lighthouse Service. It may be, owing to the increased cost of both material and labor, that three vessels can not be built out of the total appropriation, but those in charge will do the best they can.

Mr. WALSH. That is allowing an increase of a little over \$50,000 to each vessel.

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think that that is sufficient?

Mr. ESCH. I greatly doubt it. I remember that the Coast Guard Service had an appropriation three years ago of some \$300,000 for a revenue cutter. It was not built at the time, and I understand that before they got it constructed it cost \$700,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In relation to the inquiry propounded by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I will state that the Secretary of Commerce suggested that the estimated cost was obtained from the War Industrial Board, that being the most practical estimate that could be applied to this measure.

Mr. WALSH. But, of course, these estimates were in December, 1917, and the gentleman is aware of the great increase of cost since then.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes; but I was only endeavoring to suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that we endeavored to get the best evidence obtainable to determine the cost of the vessels.

Mr. WALSH. I am sure the committee has not acted without accurate information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman state to what extent these old vessels are sent outside?

Mr. ESCH. They are confined practically to the harbors in the wintertime on account of floating ice.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There are three vessels which the committee desire to renew—the *Gardenia*, the *John Rogers*, and the *Mistletoe*. The *Jessamine* is an old vessel, and I know something about her; but I wanted to know if any of these old vessels are sent outside into the open sea. There is a good deal of open-sea work done.

Mr. ESCH. I doubt it; I think the *John Rogers* does some work up around Long Island Sound.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Such vessels ought not to be sent out.

Mr. ESCH. No; it would endanger the life of the officers and crew.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Anyone who follows the progress of the Lighthouse Service knows that we are using some extremely old vessels that ought to be replaced by modern vessels, not only for efficiency of service but for the safety of the lives of the officers and men on board. My recollection is that there was an appropriation of \$200,000 in a previous bill. Did that become a law?

Mr. ESCH. That was the act of August 28, 1916. It is a law.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That was for vessels on the Pacific coast.

Mr. ESCH. There were two provided for, as I recollect, one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A lighthouse tender was lost out there.

Mr. ESCH. There was one lost off the New England coast early this winter. She was a lightship, and no trace of her has been found. Vessel and crew both are lost, so we have to constantly supply new vessels, because of obsolescence and because of loss by hazards of the sea.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My recollection is that in the bill we provided for certain tenders on the Pacific coast, and that that was held up here for some time and did not get through. Does the gentleman recall that?

Mr. ESCH. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported out the bill, which became the act of August 28, 1916, making provisions for these two vessels, but it was some time before the Committee on Appropriations made the necessary appropriations to carry that out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the Commissioner of Lighthouses suggest this \$760,000 will be sufficient, so far as new construction is concerned, to bring the service up to date?

Mr. ESCH. He believes it may not be sufficient, in view of the high prices, to build three vessels to supplant the three that I have mentioned.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He probably could not build three vessels for that price now.

Mr. ESCH. No; but they want to do as much as they can and meet the emergency as soon as possible.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the committee thinks this is the best it can do.

Mr. ESCH. This is the best we can do. Another item that may be called to the attention of the House is contained in section 2, on page 3, with reference to allowing the Government to pay for subsistence and the traveling expenses of teachers to the isolated dwelling houses of the lighthouse keepers in certain places. The State of Maine is now doing something in this direction, the State paying the expense of the school-teachers, but not the traveling expenses and the subsistence. We thought it would be wise to have that appropriation made, and if made it will entail possible not more than \$4,000 per annum.

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to my colleague that the State of Maine also pays the cost of the textbooks.

Mr. ESCH. The State of Maine does that. In England, in the British Isles generally, they have a very generous provision so that the children of the lighthouse keepers are educated at the expense of the State. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS] has taken up quite fully the retirement provision, and I concur in every argument that he has presented in support of that proposition. I wish to supplement what he has said in support of section 7, providing for an increase in the pay of the superintendents of lighthouses. We have changed the designation of these officials. They are now called lighthouse inspectors. In this bill we wish to designate them as superintendents of lighthouses, which is the old designation which obtained the early half of the last century. We increased their pay from \$2,400 to \$3,000. This is a very modest increase, when we consider the capacity and ability and responsibility of these officials. On an average they have 1,000 miles of sea coast under their jurisdiction. They have about 280 men under their charge. They have Government property of a value of about \$3,000,000. The annual disbursements are something like \$300,000, and they have on an average seven vessels under their charge. Men who have such great responsibilities, who have so many men under them and so many millions of dollars of property under their control, ought certainly to be paid a wage higher than the captains of the vessels under their jurisdiction. Yet, as the situation is to-day with a pay of \$2,400, there are officials in the various lighthouse districts, captains of vessels, and so forth, who get more pay than the district superintendents. Under these conditions we feel that the increase of only \$600 to these deserving officials is entirely justified.

These men must be experienced in navigation, they must be practical navigators, they must have a knowledge of engineering, and practically every one of the lighthouse inspectors have had some education along engineering lines, and they have come up from other mechanical or engineering or scientific departments of the Government. Some of them have come to the Lighthouse Service from the Coast and Geodetic Survey. They must be capable of superintending the construction of a lighthouse in their district or any other engineering work of that kind. They must have a broad knowledge and large experience, and for these reasons we feel justified in asking for this very modest increase.

Mr. ROBBINS. What increase does the bill carry over the present?

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS] stated that the increase due to section 6, which is the retirement provision, is \$106,000.

Mr. DOREMUS. Estimated at \$106,000.

Mr. ROBBINS. What is the increase in pay in addition to that?

Mr. ESCH. The increase of these superintendents of lighthouses would amount to \$7,800.

Mr. ROBBINS. And that is all the increase in the bill?

Mr. ESCH. There is an increase in the lighthouse keepers' pay from a maximum of \$600, where it is now, to \$700, as contained in the bill.

Mr. ROBBINS. And there are how many of those?

Mr. ESCH. There are about 1,800 lighthouses in the United States and its Territories.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] explaining so clearly the provisions of this bill. I agree that some of the increases of this measure are justified, but I

do not agree as to the increases of the salaries of these inspectors. In the report their qualifications are given, but they omit to mention what I think is also an important qualification for inspector of lighthouses, and that is that he shall be to some extent a competent and astute politician. Now they are paid \$2,400 a year except in the New York district, and he is paid, I understand, \$3,000.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. RUCKER. In view of the remark the gentleman has just made, I want to ask for information, if he has ever been an inspector of a lighthouse?

Mr. WALSH. No; I have never been inspector of a lighthouse, never having applied for that position, but if I had I have some doubt whether I could have qualified in this latter respect, especially during the past six years. Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a small increase for the lighthouse keepers in this service from \$600 to \$700, and I think a small increase in the ration allowance. They are the men who have the responsibility; they are the men who do the work and who are required to be on the spot; and they are the men who feel more keenly the increased demands upon them to raise a family or to live properly in these times of extravagant prices for the ordinary necessities of life. We give them a paltry increase, I think, of \$100 or thereabouts, a year, and I say it is hardly a sufficient increase for these men who do this work, who have to be on the job during the lonely hours of the night to see that the lights are kept burning and the danger signals sounded, many of them located in positions where the ordinary man would not accept employment or appointment to that position for three times, yes, five times the salary, and yet we come in here and increase them but \$100 a year, while to these inspectors, who have a roving commission and whose traveling expenses are paid, at least within their districts, who can live in comfort, if not in luxury, but who can live upon their salary, we grant them an increase of \$600 a year by this bill. I submit they are in that class of Government employees who ought not to take advantage of this war situation and ask and expect this Congress to increase their compensation at this time. I say, Mr. Chairman, it is a shame upon the Federal service that these higher-paid officials, getting \$2,400 to \$2,500 a year and \$3,000 a year, should at this time, in the midst of this great war, when we are laying heavy burdens upon the taxpayers of this country, expect us to increase their salaries.

Mr. DOREMUS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. DOREMUS. I understand the superintendent of the lighthouse district in the gentleman's district lives in Boston.

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir; in or near Boston; just outside of Boston, I think.

Mr. DOREMUS. Would the gentleman expect him to live on less than \$3,000 a year in these times?

Mr. WALSH. Well, we have got hundreds of Federal employees living in Boston, and if he can not live on \$2,400 why do not we increase all Federal employees to \$3,000?

Mr. DOREMUS. Does the gentleman know that practically everyone in the public service to-day is having a hard time to make both ends meet?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly; from Federal judges down; but some can economize more easily than others.

Mr. DOREMUS. And is it not a fact thousands are leaving the Government service on that account?

Mr. WALSH. Thousands are leaving certain branches of the Government service and going into other branches of the Government service, or indirectly in the Government service, because private establishments engaged on Government work are paying higher wages; but I submit it is no reason why the Government should embark upon a wholesale program of increasing Government salaries while we are in this war, particularly as to the higher paid officials. I have said several times before that it is time that we evince some spirit of economy in making these appropriations for compensation and salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield me five minutes additional?

Mr. ESCH. Another five minutes.

Mr. WALSH. On the contrary, in many bills that come before the House carrying appropriations for Federal employees constantly we are met with the plea that we should increase the compensation of men getting twenty-four hundred dollars and more per annum. Mr. Chairman, I fear before this struggle is over that many of us who have yielded in many instances to these pleas and arguments will regret that we did not go slower when acting on their demands and requests but had attempted to conserve the resources of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. FOSTER. The legislative and executive bill carried an increase of \$120 up to \$2,000—

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOSTER. And now it is proposed here to increase, as the gentleman says, these men \$500 or \$600—

Mr. WALSH. Six hundred dollars for the inspectors.

Mr. FOSTER. And the poor lighthouse keeper gets \$600 and it increases him \$120?

Mr. WALSH. A hundred and twenty dollars or thereabouts. Talk about responsibility! The responsibility is not greater now than it was before; but I think the responsibility of the light keeper who is charged with the light, or the man upon the light vessel miles out at sea, during these past few days has increased greatly, and I should think—

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. ESCH. As to the increase of duties of these officials, I wish to state that 1,200 employees of the Lighthouse Service are now called into the military service and are serving under the Army or the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; because the Lighthouse Service is part of the Coast Guard, which under the law during war times is turned over to the jurisdiction of the Navy Department.

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman is mistaken; the Lighthouse Service is not part of the new Coast Guard, but it is the Life-Saving Service.

Mr. WALSH. I am in error as to that; the Lighthouse Service is not in the Coast Guard; but if men in the Lighthouse Service are being called to military or naval service what sort of a substitute are you going to get in their place at this rate of pay? What sort of efficiency, what degree of responsibility, can you expect when you hold out to a man a salary of \$700 to become practically a hermit in a lighthouse?

Mr. FOSTER. Living on that little salary, would he not be glad to be called into the service?

Mr. WALSH. I should imagine perhaps he might, at least you would have hard work to attract him from other service to take a position like that. But the service must be maintained, and especially during these war times.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the committee had, in considering this bill, decided to increase these \$600 employees to \$900—yes, or to \$1,000—I submit that it would have been justifiable under the facts and under existing conditions, but when we give them the small increase, and then as to the inspectors—who apparently dislike the title of "inspector," which has been borne by them for years, and who now prefer to be known as "superintendents of lighthouses"—we increase the salary by \$600. That is not in keeping with the treatment accorded to employees in other branches of the service, nor is it in keeping with the precedents heretofore set by this Congress in dealing with compensation of Federal officials. And I trust the committee will not seriously object to an amendment increasing the salaries of the light keepers. The section of the country from which I come, as well as the sections from which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Doremus] come, have many of these employees, either upon light vessels or in lighthouses. We recognize that it would be impossible for the great water commerce of this country to be conducted safely or profitably unless we have an efficient Lighthouse Service. And I trust that the House will be willing to increase these lower-paid officials and, if necessary, sacrifice the increase granted to the inspectors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hicks].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, the sea with its vast expanse, and mighty distances stretching to the far corners of the earth, appeals to the imagination and envelops commerce with the cloak of romance. I congratulate the committee for bringing forward a measure so meritorious as this Lighthouse bill, and I hope they will soon bring into Congress the Coast Guard bill, another measure deserving of favorable consideration.

The Long Island district which I have the honor to represent has a coast line exceeded by only a few districts in the United States. Everything which pertains to the sea and which affects the men whose calling takes them upon the waters is of vital interest to many of the people whose commission I bear. Having always been interested personally in our splendid Life-Saving, Revenue-Cutter, and Lighthouse Service, with the indulgence of the House I desire to say a few words in reference to the Coast Guard bill soon to be considered, which includes the provisions of a bill introduced by myself some time ago.

Encircling my district like a chain of sentry posts on the frontiers of the deep, are 28 life-saving stations of the Coast Guard and 20 lighthouses and 2 lightships; the one, beacons to warn mariners of the dangers of the coast and aid them in the navigation of our seas and bays; the other, the great agent of mercy alleviating the sufferings and perhaps saving the lives of shipwrecked voyagers. Both are for the protection of life and property; both mitigate the perils of the sea; both are essential to the mighty commerce whose rapid increase heralds the reestablishment of our Nation as one of the great maritime powers of the world and which again, as in days gone by, will ply the seven seas under the American flag.

The Coast Guard is a union of the Revenue-Cutter Service and the Life-Saving Service, created by act of Congress approved January 28, 1915.

At the second session of the First Congress, in response to the need felt for a coast patrol to enforce the customs laws, as well as for an armed force for the protection of the sea-coast—there being no navy at that time—there was established in 1790 the Revenue-Cutter Service. With the growth of the Nation, in order to properly care for the constantly increasing requirements of our maritime interests, additional duties were successively added to the service, until at the time of the passage of the Coast Guard act this service had become a most important branch of our establishment, specializing in practically all governmental maritime activities.

The Life-Saving Service does not owe its origin to a single legislative act, but is the result of gradual growth, formed by a series of enactments dating back to 1848. Until 1871 the work of this service was desultory, and while the work of rescuing life and property from shipwreck was carried forward, the results were not satisfactory. In 1871 a well organized life-saving system was inaugurated, which was administered in conjunction with the Revenue-Cutter Service until 1878 when Congress established the Life-Saving Service as a separate unit. With the enlargement of both branches of the service their respective fields of action overlapped to some extent and supplemented each other in the work of conservation of life and property. To bring about closer cooperation and increased efficiency, Congress, by act of January 28, 1915, united the two services in one organization known as the United States Coast Guard. Under the provisions of this act the Coast Guard "shall constitute a part of the military forces of the United States and shall operate under the Treasury Department in time of peace and operate as a part of the Navy in time of war, or when the President shall so direct."

While it is difficult to enumerate all the duties performed by this important service, for it is essentially an emergency service, the following are the principal activities of the Coast Guard:

1. Rendering assistance to vessels in distress and saving life and property.
2. Destruction or removal of wrecks, derelicts, and other floating dangers to navigation.
3. Extending medical aid to American vessels engaged in deep-sea fisheries.
4. Protection of the customs revenue.
5. Operating as a part of the Navy in time of war or when the President shall direct.
6. Enforcement of law and regulations governing anchorage of vessels in navigable waters.
7. Enforcement of law relating to quarantine and neutrality.
8. Suppression of mutinies on merchant vessels.
9. Enforcement of navigation and other laws governing merchant vessels and motor boats.
10. Enforcement of law to provide for safety of life on navigable waters during regattas and marine parades.
11. Protection of game and the seal and other fisheries in Alaska, etc.
12. Enforcement of sponge-fishing law.
13. International ice patrol of the Grand Banks.

It seems to be generally accepted that the Coast Guard should be called upon by all the great departments of the Government for special work of a maritime character for which no other vessels are especially maintained.

During all periods of the year and at such times as least to interfere with the emergent duties of a civil nature, a rigid system of military discipline and training is maintained to fit the personnel for the duty of operating as a part of the Navy at any time, as the law requires. This function of the Coast Guard has always been of value, since in all wars to which the United States has been a party, the Government has had at hand an auxiliary force, properly disciplined and trained, ready to become a part of the regular naval forces as occasion required. This attribute is now the paramount function of the Coast Guard, as all its facilities are now being employed in the prosecution of the existing war.

Upon the declaration of war on April 6, 1917, the Coast Guard with all its personnel and equipment came under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, and the record made in the last 14 months is most commendable. The service was at once placed upon a war basis, additional men enlisted to fill vacancies, vessels equipped, stations brought up to the highest degree of efficiency, and the lines of coastal communication extended. To perfect the patrol system, there were constructed 750 miles of overhead telephone wires and 300 miles of submarine cables. By these additions and improvements immediate communication may be had between any point on the Atlantic coast and Washington. The present personnel consists of 229 commissioned officers and 5,000 warrant officers and enlisted men. There are 273 stations equipped with life-saving apparatus on the coasts and on the shores of the Great Lakes. The service has 21 seagoing cutters, with 5 more authorized, and about 25 smaller vessels. In a general way there are two kinds of units in the Coast Guard—ships and stations; the ships corresponding to the units of the former Revenue-Cutter Service and the stations corresponding to the units of the former Life-Saving Service. The personnel consists of commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, and the enlisted men. The commissioned officers are captains and lieutenants who are line officers, engineer officers of corresponding rank, superintendents who were transferred from the Life-Saving Service, and constructors. The warrant officers are master's mates, boatswains, keepers, gunners, carpenters, and machinists. The petty officers include masters at arms, No. 1 surfmen, electricians, yeomen, wheelmen, quartermasters, oilers, coxswains, baymen, and so forth. Then come the enlisted men who are not petty officers, seamen, surfmen, firemen, cooks, and so forth. Enlisted men with the rating of surfmen, petty officers with the rating of No. 1 surfman, and warrant officers of the grade of keeper are usually assigned to Coast Guard stations for life-saving duties.

In connection with the Coast Guard Academy, at New London, Conn., there has been established a recruiting and training station where recruits are enlisted and given a three months' course of intensive training, both on shore and at sea. Last September, six of the Coast Guard cutters were thoroughly outfitted and equipped with larger guns than those used in peace times, and these vessels are now operating in the submarine zone under the command of Admiral Sims. Five naval training stations and two naval aviation stations are under the charge of Coast Guard officers. In addition, two officers of this service, under the provisions of the espionage act have been made captains of the port and given authority over all merchant vessels entering and leaving the harbors of New York and Norfolk. The Coast Guard is also enforcing the regulations in reference to the loading of high explosives in the port of New York, and every ammunition ship is now anchored and her cargo taken on board under the immediate direction and supervision of a commissioned Coast Guard officer assisted by armed guards to insure rigid compliance with the regulations. The waterways between Lakes Superior and Huron through which most of the iron ore consigned for war purposes is transported is under the patrol and protection of the Coast Guard.

In every way in which service can be rendered in the prosecution of the war, this branch of our fighting force is performing its duty, fully and effectively. Let me pay my respects to the captain commandant of the service, Capt. Ellsworth P. Bertholf, an officer of wide experience and sound executive judgment, and to all the officers who are doing such splendid work in maintaining the service on a high plane of efficiency. I want to pay a tribute to the enlisted men who face the dangers of war and the perils of the sea with courage and determination. Their loyalty and patriotism have never been questioned, their valor and heroism never doubted, and they merit the highest praise for their unflinching response to duty, for their self-sacrificing devotion to their hazardous calling, and for their bravery in times of disaster, which endows their perilous vocation with the noblest attributes of humanity—the saving of lives and the ministering to those in distress.

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order. I understand the discussion is to be confined to the bill, but I want to speak on a matter separate from that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I intend to present to the House a very interesting communication which I received in this morning's mail. A group known as the Czecho-Slovak Workingmen's Council, writing from Cedar Rapids, Iowa, tell

me that the governor of the State of Iowa has issued an order that no language other than English shall be used in public; that no language other than English shall be used in communications on the telephone or in places of public worship.

In a most remarkable document, a parallel to which can not be found except in the Middle Ages, he says that while freedom of speech is guaranteed by the Federal Constitution and the State constitution, it is not a guaranty of the right to use a language other than the official language of the country. And since English is the official language of the State and of the United States no other language shall be used. Then he proceeds to say in his proclamation:

Each person is guaranteed freedom to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, but this guaranty does not protect him in the use of a foreign language when he can as well express his thought in English, nor entitle the person who can not speak or understand the English language to employ a foreign language, when to do so tends, in time of national peril, to create discord among neighbors and citizens or to disturb the peace and quiet of the community.

Later on he says, and I will incorporate the entire proclamation in my remarks:

Therefore the following rules shall obtain in Iowa during the war:
First. English should and must be the only medium of instruction in public, private, denominational, or other similar schools.

Second. Conversation in public places, on trains, and over the telephones should be in the English language.

Third. All public addresses should be in the English language.
Fourth. Let those who can not speak or understand the English language conduct their religious worship in their homes.

Now, it is evident that some public officials suffer from that peculiar form of insanity which comes about with war. To prohibit a man from using the language which he knows, and the only language in which he can express his thoughts, is to seal his lips and deprive him of the right to speak. To prevent a person from worshipping God in any language except the official language would be to destroy a fundamental right, an elementary right, which lies at the very basis of this Republic.

Where do these men get their authority? Where do they get their law? Where, in all history, has any free country issued a similar ukase?

The protest to me is sent by a group of Czecho-Slovaks, or Bohemians. We know that the Bohemians have sent a regiment from this country to the front in France. They are the noblest and bravest fighters that the allies have. They are fighting not only for the United States but they are intensely interested in the problems confronting the small nationalities of Austria-Hungary. To them the war is a holy war, a war of emancipation for their own people. They left the security of the United States, those who were not of draft age, in order to get to the western front to fight the fight of nations. These men are prohibited by the silly order of an unthinking official from using the only language in which they can appeal to one another.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for a minute?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Has the gentleman verified the correctness of that report? I am surprised to hear that any governor of a State would issue a proclamation prohibiting the speaking of anything but the English tongue. I can not believe a report of that kind is even accurate.

Mr. LONDON. I am glad the gentleman has that opinion. I have seen it in the public print, and the letter to which I have referred incloses a clipping from one of the newspapers in Iowa, which attempts to defend the governor, and gives his proclamation in full.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is that supposed to be signed by the governor of the State?

Mr. LONDON. It is signed by the governor, W. L. Harding, at Des Moines, Iowa, and bears the date the 23d day of May, 1918. I assume that the newspapers have not given it sufficient publicity, because probably most of them were ashamed of the very thought that such a thing was possible, of the very idea that such a thing is possible in the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the governor of a State has seen fit to go beyond all power recognized under the American Constitution or American institutions, he has not any authority to enforce such extreme proposals as he attempts to do.

Mr. LONDON. I know he has not; but the unfortunate part of it is that he occupies the position of an executive officer of the State; he has the police power and the militia of the State at his disposal. In other words, he has the physical force, supposed to be used by the State for the welfare of the State only; he has that physical power to back up his opinion.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the police force of the State is limited to the enforcement of the law, and the governor is governor only within the bounds of the law, and if he has issued an extra-judicial decree he has no authority to put it into force,

and if he attempts it the courts are there to protect the rights and privileges of the citizen.

Mr. LONDON. I entirely agree with the gentleman's construction of the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the gentleman any information as to whether the governor issued this proclamation in pursuance of or in accordance with the authority of the legislature?

Mr. LONDON. No. The legislature has not acted in the matter. It is the individual act of the governor, the executive of the State.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the gentleman any information, waiving the statement in reference to the order, as to what was the occasion of the order?

Mr. LONDON. As far as the press would indicate, there was a movement among certain people in the State of Iowa—and I understand there is a movement among certain people in other States—to prohibit the use of any language other than English, out of a patriotic desire to see one language used in this time of crisis. But the mistake that these well-intentioned men make is that you can not appeal to people except in a language they do understand, that the only way of Americanizing one who is born in a foreign country is to teach him in his own language the value of American institutions. You can not reach him by a language that he does not understand. It is too elementary to require discussion. In other words, a man must in his own mother tongue learn to love and respect everything that is valuable in American institutions. You can not adopt, in the interest of uniformity of language, the foolish policy that has been destructive of public order in Austria-Hungary. There is a fundamental difference between assimilation in the United States and assimilation in other countries where it is the result of physical coercion. In Austria-Hungary the Hungarians have been trying for years to suppress the various Slav languages. In the German portion of Austria-Hungary they have been trying to suppress every language outside of German, with the result that they have aroused a profound sense of national pride in all of the smaller nationalities. There is nothing that will so stimulate the love of one's own distinctive language as persecution. Where you will accomplish things with love, you will produce the very opposite effect by coercion and oppression. There are well-meaning men who would like to see everyone speak the same language, but it can not be accomplished by mere edict. It must be the result of a process of education, of bringing up people to learn to love the institutions of the country. It can not be done by duress.

I hope that Congress will at an early opportunity express itself on the action of the governor.

Gentlemen, I thank you for your attention.

I give here the full text of the proclamation:

To the people of Iowa:

Whereas our country is engaged in war with foreign powers; and
Whereas controversy has arisen in parts of this State concerning the use of foreign languages:

Therefore, for the purpose of ending such controversy and to bring about peace, quiet, and harmony among our people, attention is directed to the following, and all are requested to govern themselves accordingly:

The official language of the United States and the State of Iowa is the English language. Freedom of speech is guaranteed by Federal and State Constitutions, but this is not a guaranty of the right to use a language other than the language of this country—the English language. Both Federal and State Constitutions also provide that "no laws shall be made respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Each person is guaranteed freedom to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; but this guaranty does not protect him in the use of a foreign language when he can as well express his thought in English, nor entitle the person who can not speak or understand the English language to employ a foreign language, when to do so tends, in time of national peril, to create discord among neighbors and citizens, or to disturb the peace and quiet of the community.

Every person should appreciate and observe his duty to refrain from all acts or conversation which may excite suspicion or produce strife among the people, but in his relation to the public should so demean himself that every word and act will manifest his loyalty to his country and his solemn purpose to aid in achieving victory for our Army and Navy and the permanent peace of the world.

If there must be disagreement, let adjustment be made by those in official authority rather than by the participants in the disagreement. Voluntary or self-constituted committees or associations undertaking the settlement of such disputes, instead of promoting peace and harmony, are a menace to society and a fruitful cause of violence. The great aim and object of all should be unity of purpose and a solidarity of all the people under the flag of victory. This much we owe to ourselves, to posterity, to our country, and to the world.

Therefore, the following rules should obtain in Iowa during the war:
First. English should and must be the only medium of instruction in public, private, denominational, or other similar schools.

Second. Conversation in public places, on trains, and over the telephones should be in the English language.

Third. All public addresses should be in the English language.

Fourth. Let those who can not speak or understand the English language conduct their religious worship in their homes.

This course carried out in the spirit of patriotism, though inconvenient to some, will not interfere with their guaranteed constitutional rights and will result in peace and tranquillity at home and greatly strengthen the country in battle. The blessings of the United States are so great that any inconvenience or sacrifice should willingly be made for their perpetuity.

Therefore, by virtue of authority in me vested, I, W. L. Harding, governor of the State of Iowa, commend the spirit of tolerance and urge that henceforward the within outlined rules be adhered to by all, that petty differences be avoided and forgotten, and that, united as one people with one purpose and one language, we fight shoulder to shoulder for the good of mankind.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines this 23d day of May, 1918.

By the governor:

W. L. HARDING.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Chairman, may we have the bill read now for amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL SERVICE.

Constructing or purchasing and equipping lighthouse tenders and light vessels, to replace vessels worn out in service, in the third, fifth, and eighth lighthouse districts, or for use in the Lighthouse Service generally, \$760,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 2, line 2, after the numerals "\$760,000," insert the following new paragraph:

"SECOND LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

"The sum of \$15,000 appropriated in an act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, approved March 28, 1918, for the installation of an electrically operated block signal on the East Breakwater, Nantucket Harbor, Mass., is hereby made available for an electrically operated fog bell at said point."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to waive the privilege of amending the first paragraph, but by unanimous consent I would like to have the present amendment considered without waiving that privilege, in order to make some inquiries as to the first paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will prefer, I will withhold it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move, then, to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe that I am correct in the assumption that this is the first time any committee of Congress has deputed to an executive officer the privilege of determining the number of vessels and the limit of cost of vessels within a stated total authorization, as is accomplished in the paragraph beginning on line 10 of page 1.

Heretofore, as I have understood the practice of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of other committees, they have placed a limit of cost on the amount that may be expended by the executive officer. But here this committee for the first time vests in the discretion of the executive officer the determination of the number of vessels that may be purchased without any limit of cost other than the total gross authorization. The phraseology, as the committee will notice, is "constructing or purchasing and equipping lighthouse tenders and light vessels."

If I am not mistaken, in the Book of Estimates the Department of Commerce specified the number of vessels that might be available for each respective district, namely, the third, the fifth, and the eighth districts, and the amount that could be utilized for each. I question the advisability of Congress leaving it to an executive head to determine the character of vessel, leaving it to his full discretion to have merely one vessel within the maximum amount of \$750,000, if he so wishes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman submit to a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be very glad to.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Is the gentleman not conscious of the fact that the cost of vessels has gone up so much that the estimates made on each of these vessels would not perhaps get one of them?

Mr. STAFFORD. If that is the fact, then the Congress should determine it and not leave it to the executive head to determine the construction of a vessel beyond all bounds which it is intended to provide for.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. It is not intended to change the construction of the vessels in any particular. We leave the construction plans exactly the same.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is nothing here to show that you leave the construction plans the same. In the Book of Estimates there was a certain limit of appropriation.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. This limits it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the limit?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. The limit is on the vessels—so much.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is a provision made for three vessels?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And yet he is privileged to use all this amount for one vessel?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No; it will not be done in that way.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman makes an assumption that is not based on the facts. The hearings show and the report shows that it is the purpose to leave with the executive officers the privilege of using all this money for one vessel if they see fit.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Not if they see fit, but if they find it necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the difference between fitness, propriety, and necessity? I question whether that should be the policy of Congress, especially at this time. I would place some limit of cost on these vessels and not leave it to the executive officer to determine the maximum price of the vessel without any limit of cost. Under this practice what restriction is there upon the executive officer as to the furnishings of the vessel? It has been and is the purpose to place a limit of cost upon these vessels.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. We are very anxious—

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. We are very anxious to get all the vessels we can, and the most useful, under the simplest and cheapest plan, but we have got to get vessels of some kind, and the estimates were made some time ago. If you made an estimate for boats some years ago, you would not get any boats now for the amount you estimated then.

Mr. STAFFORD. The excuse that the gentleman advances might be advanced for every character of construction that is authorized by the Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Would it not be very much better and cost less to require the Secretary of Commerce to make a new estimate than to charge him with the responsibility of spending the money without limit?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is precisely correct from a business man's standpoint and the governmental standpoint. It is always the policy of the Government to place a limit of cost on these respective vessels. But here the committee places no limit of cost. If it is found that the limit of cost is not sufficient he can come to the respective committees and have the limit of cost increased, but I protest against this policy of granting freedom without limit at all to the executive officers to spend the entire amount for one vessel. I really believe it is open to severe criticism from a governmental standpoint.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is under the impression that the entire paragraph should be read.

Mr. MADDEN. This is an appropriation bill, is it not, and is being considered by paragraphs instead of by sections?

Mr. DOREMUS. It is not an appropriation bill. It is a bill authorizing appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it should be read by sections. If the gentleman will wait a moment, the Chair will have the entire section read.

Mr. DOREMUS. The Chair is absolutely correct.

The Clerk completed the reading of section 1.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. RUCKER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on June 4, 1918, approved and signed bill of the following title:

H. R. 12280. An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, on account of war expenses and for other purposes.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION IN LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Of course if we need lightships or lighthouse tenders,

we should have them, and the proper provision should be made to secure them, but the language in the paragraph which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to replace vessels that are worn out in the service in the third, fifth, and eighth lighthouse districts, or for the use of lighthouses generally, does not specify what the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to do specifically. It authorizes the appropriation of \$760,000, and he can spend that \$760,000 on any one ship or vessel.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Is this an authorization or an appropriation?

Mr. MADDEN. It is an authorization.

Mr. GARNER. Of course the appropriation probably would take care of that situation.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think it would, because I think this authorization would make it mandatory upon the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate the entire amount for a single vessel if the Secretary of Commerce wanted that to be done.

Mr. WALSH. If he spent \$760,000 for a single vessel he would not be replacing vessels worn out in the third, fifth, and eighth lighthouse districts.

Mr. MADDEN. No; he would not.

Mr. WALSH. He is supposed to build three vessels. If he builds only one he is not doing what is provided in the authorization.

Mr. STAFFORD. He could use one vessel for that purpose.

Mr. DUPRE. The gentleman, I presume, has read the report wherein the Secretary himself indicates how it is proposed to use this sum, and where the amount is divided in the report, \$200,000 for one, \$200,000 for another, and \$160,000 for a third. The Secretary himself having made that report, is it fair to presume that he would try to spend it all on one vessel?

Mr. MADDEN. It is fair to presume that the responsibility of authorizing this work to be done is upon us, and I see no reason why we should evade the responsibility that we have by transferring it to the Secretary of Commerce or to anybody else. If the Secretary of Commerce says that he wants to expend \$200,000 here, \$200,000 there, and \$160,000 somewhere else, and we agree that he should be permitted to do it, why not say so in the bill?

Why do we want to give him blanket authority to do something that we afterwards will know nothing about? There can be no question but that under the language of this paragraph he would have the power to expend \$760,000 on a single vessel and transfer that vessel from one district to another if he thought proper, and thereby come within the spirit of the law if he did not comply with the letter of the law.

I am not saying that he will do that. I assume that he will exercise proper discretion in the expenditure of the money placed at his disposal, but why should we evade the responsibility that we have and leave him the latitude that this law, if enacted, will give to him? Why should not we say what the law is to be, what the expenditures are for, and where the vessels are to be used?

I am not criticizing the wisdom or integrity of the Secretary of Commerce. I am not criticizing his judgment, but I am unalterably opposed to the relinquishment of the responsibility we have imposed on us and the transfer of that responsibility to some one else. I want in every case where it is possible and proper for the Congress to specifically set forth what it intends the money it appropriates shall be expended for. Why should not we do that? Is there any reason why we should say that our knowledge is so meager that we must transfer the power to somebody else to do what he pleases regardless of the limits of cost? It is true that the Secretary of Commerce will be obliged to come to the Appropriations Committee and get the money under this authorization, but even then he need not furnish more than one vessel for the total amount of the money here authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the committee is not attempting to evade responsibility, it is endeavoring to comply with a responsibility. The evasion suggested by the gentleman from Illinois grows out of an inability to fulfill a responsibility and that inability grows in turn out of the industrial and economic conditions of the country resulting from this world conflict. I am almost tempted to tell an anecdote to illustrate this inability.

I once knew a mayor of a town who was perturbed that the fire bells on the preceding night did not give the sound of alarm of a disastrous fire. So he gravely moved the council of the town that the fire bells be tested every half hour preceding any fire that might thereafter occur. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. That would not be a bad scheme in this instance. I suggest that the committee ought to test their own

wisdom by the introduction of the amount suggested by the Secretary of Commerce that will be required for each district.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am sorry the gentleman from Illinois does not appreciate the moral of my anecdote. I know that the gentleman is very able about business questions as well as other questions; but to be sober—

Mr. MADDEN. This has no connection with the bottles found in the House Office Building?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; I am speaking of the "feast of reason and the flow of soul" and not of bottles. There is no way now to estimate in advance, even approximately, what each vessel will cost. It was manifest to the committee that the purpose of the Secretary is to build the number of ships covered by these districts. Whether he can do it or not we do not know. When the committee came to the question of apportioning a sum for each vessel it was confronted with impossibility, illustrated by my anecdote, and therefore the committee said it would not undertake to do an administrative act that under present conditions it could not meet. It therefore decided to perform the legislative function and leave the Secretary of Commerce to perform the executive or administrative duty.

He has no motive, no purpose, to escape his duty or to make the cost one bit larger than is actually necessary. The Government needs these vessels; it has to have them. I would suggest, with all deference to my friend from Illinois, that there is no trouble about the precedent; the Committee on Appropriations will take care of the division or apportionment of the total sum. The cost when the committee wrote the bill might not be the cost to-day, to-morrow, or the week after, it would be a mere question of approximation, and in my own judgment these administrative details under existing abnormal conditions Congress ought not to bother with.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman elaborate and explain how the Committee on Appropriations can take care of the matter as suggested by him?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the Appropriations Committee can say so much for one vessel and so much for another if it thinks it wise to do so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not within the power of the executive heads under this authorization to construct one lighthouse tender to cost \$760,000 without any action or approval by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think so; I think the Committee on Appropriations must give the money.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I say that this is an authorization for an executive head to enter into a contract and the Committee on Appropriations will have to vote the necessary money to carry it out.

Mr. DUPRE. Does it not take four or five years to get the committee to act after Congress has passed the authorization?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suspect the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRE] is entirely correct. As a practical matter, if but one vessel can be got for \$750,000, would it not be better to get that one than to get none at all? I do not, of course, think that sum will be required; but if the abnormal conditions of the country are such that we can not secure a vessel for a smaller price, it may be wiser to get that one than none at all, for conditions may go from bad to worse and we must protect our water-borne commerce. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered does not appropriate any money. The appropriation has heretofore been made and the department finds that they can not install the character of fog signal, namely, a whistle, for that sum of money. Rather than ask for an increase in the appropriation, I desire to make that sum available for the installation of a fog bell, and that is at the suggestion of the Lighthouse Department.

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Chairman, I would state that the amendment is satisfactory to the committee. I have talked with several of the members.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, would the committee have any objection to an amendment inserting a limit of cost upon the authorization which the department might utilize in the construction of these vessels?

Mr. DOREMUS. We have very serious objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought perhaps you might put the amount at \$300,000, so as to give ample leeway to the department.

Mr. DOREMUS. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, the committee gave this matter very serious consideration. The committee feel that they have applied to this particular item the only business method that can be applied under the circumstances and get results. There is little to add to what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] has already said. The experience of the Coast Guard in the construction of vessels ought to be a guide to the committee in considering this provision. I think it was in 1914 or 1915 that an authorization of \$350,000 was made for the construction of a vessel. Before the department could prepare the plans and get the bids the cost of materials and construction had so increased that the amount appropriated or authorized was entirely inadequate. They came back to Congress and got a second authorization, and before they could prepare plans and specifications the cost of materials and construction had so advanced that the second authorization was inadequate. They came back to Congress the third time, and the result is that to-day they are paying something over \$600,000 for vessels that could originally have been purchased under the discretion provided here for \$350,000. The committee did not reach this conclusion hastily. They gave mature deliberation to it, and, I repeat, we have endeavored to apply the only business method that can be applied and get the vessels in a time like this.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I might agree with the logic of the position of the gentleman if I would accept as a premise that it was absolutely necessary, regardless of cost, to have these vessels; but having served on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I recognize that there are times, and these are such times, when the present vessels may be continued in the service without invading the welfare of the service, and then it might not be good business policy, with the increasing cost of manufacturing and production, to have them substituted with new vessels.

It is that policy which I criticize in this blanket form of authorization. If the committee were acquainted with the facts, I do not believe that the existing vessels, even though they are worn in some particulars, should be substituted, but they could be continued in service for another 5 or 10 years, and that the existing high prices, with demands for boilers, engines, hulls in our naval and merchant-marine service, do not justify us in paying 5 or 10 prices for a temporary expedient that could be postponed for 5 or 10 years. I consider it would be good business policy to postpone the effectiveness of this authorization.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. The gentleman from Wisconsin has suggested that the committee did not know their business when they made this provision. To the effect that if they had known what they were about they would not have done what they have done.

Mr. STAFFORD. I made no charge against the illustrious committee and certainly not against the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW], who is an illustrious member of this illustrious committee.

Mr. WINSLOW. Even so, would the gentleman be kind enough to correct my impression as to what he did say? [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. I would rather not burden the House to that extent.

Mr. WINSLOW. I shall come to the point I had in mind, and that is to ask the gentleman on what superior information he bases his statement in reference to the needs of the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. I stated that there are many times—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I stated that there are many times when the heads of departments come before committees, such as the Bureau of Navigation here, requesting authorization for new vessels in place of worn vessels, which could be continued in the service; but if conditions were ordinary, it would be better to have them substituted forthwith by new vessels, but under present conditions it would be far better to postpone the authorization of a lump sum for three vessels which could be utilized for one vessel until conditions become normal, so that the Congress would have some determination, and the committee should exercise that judgment in determining whether they want to have the full authorization which was intended for three vessels to be utilized for only one.

Here we grant, as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan and corroborated by the position of the distinguished and hon-

orable gentleman from Massachusetts, that the conditions demand that we should allow the department to spend all of this money for one vessel, if necessary. I question whether the hearings, which I have read, justify that position, and I will yield to the distinguished and honorable gentleman from Massachusetts and the distinguished and honorable gentleman from Michigan to justify the position that it is necessary to use all of this money for one vessel.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That hereafter the appropriation, "General expenses, Lighthouse Service," shall be available, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, for the payment of traveling and subsistence expenses of teachers while actually employed by States or private persons to instruct the children of keepers of lighthouses.

Mr. DUPRE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter to the secretary of the Board of Trade of the city of New Orleans, which I think is a complete answer to the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin that there is no necessity for authorizing light vessels at this time, even though the cost is heavy.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to have the letter read for information, because if it is inserted in the RECORD perhaps it will never be noticed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, March 14, 1918.

Mr. HERRING,
Secretary Board of Trade, New Orleans, La.

MY DEAR Mr. HERRING: We are receiving complaints from various masters regarding the entrance to South Pass, there being no lightship there any more; nothing but a small buoy, with a tinkling bell on it, which in hazy weather can not be seen or heard at any distance.

We have recently had the steamer *Williston* go ashore east of South Pass, and it is rather surprising, in the opinion of several masters, that more vessels have not been ashore at this entrance because of there being no lightship or any guide of any kind sufficiently far out to warn masters that the land is being approached.

The lighthouse is a considerable distance up the pass, and in hazy weather, when that becomes visible, the vessel is practically on top of the land already. Therefore, as a beacon, the lighthouse can not be considered of much use, except in clear weather.

Will you be kind enough to take this matter up in the proper channel and see if something could not be done to have the lightship replaced which, we understand, used to be stationed at the South Pass?

Yours, very truly,

ELDER DEMPSTER LINE AGENCY,
M. & R. WARRINER (INC.), Agents.
R. A. WARRINER, President.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That hereafter every lighthouse keeper and assistant lighthouse keeper in the Lighthouse Service of the United States shall be entitled to receive one ration per day, or, in the discretion of the Commissioner of Lighthouses, commutation therefor at the rate of 45 cents per ration.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire whether section 2 has been read. I wish to make some inquiry about that as to whether this changes existing law.

Mr. DOREMUS. Section 3?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; section 2. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee—

Mr. DOREMUS. The gentleman from Wisconsin has already explained that, I believe, to the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was probably temporarily absent from the Chamber, so I will not impose upon the committee by asking further than to inquire that I assume this is new legislation. I remember in one of the prior bills there was some estimate of the department to provide the expense money for the transportation of children of lighthouse keepers. Was that ever adopted into law?

Mr. ESCH. No; this does not go to that. This merely provides for transportation and subsistence for the teachers to the pupils, the children of lighthouse keepers. There are certain isolated places where the children of lighthouse keepers have no school facilities, and it was thought that the Government would be justified in making this small expenditure, which would not amount to more than \$4,000 in all, in order to relieve that condition. Some of the States, particularly Maine, already provide the teachers and the textbooks, and I think some other States have done something in that direction. This is to apply throughout the United States.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the gentleman will excuse me, will the gentleman please advise his colleague from Wisconsin as to what he previously said about the action of Great Britain in similar cases?

Mr. ESCH. They carry the whole cost of the education of children of lighthouse keepers. It is thought to be in the interest of the service and would help these lighthouse keepers who are far removed from centers of population and who suffer enough from isolation to secure for their families the benefits of an ordinary school education.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. That hereafter all officers and employees engaged in the field service or on vessels of the Lighthouse Service, except persons continuously employed in district offices or shops, who shall have reached the age of 65 years, after having been 30 years in the active service of the Government, may at their option be retired from further performance of duty; and all such officers and employees who shall have reached the age of 70 years shall be compulsorily retired from further performance of duty: *Provided*, That the annual compensation of persons so retired shall be a sum equal to one-fortieth of the average annual pay received for the last five years of service for each year of active service in the Lighthouse Service or in a department or branch of the Government having a retirement system, not to exceed in any case thirty-fortieths of such average annual pay received: *Provided further*, That such retirement pay shall not include any amount on account of subsistence or other allowance.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Perhaps this provision was explained at length under general debate, but I only desire to make one general inquiry, and that is as to whether this retirement feature is along the line adopted as to the Coast Guard Service?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Practically the same, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, but rather better, because it makes it dependent upon the average salary for the last five years. You can not promote a man simply for the purpose of retirement.

Mr. HICKS. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to say in reference to his inquiry as to the Coast Guard that they have three provisions for retirement, or at least three classes. One is compulsory on reaching the age of 64, one optional with the department after 30 years' service, and the other is for physical disability, granted by a retiring board.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think this is not as liberal as the Coast Guard.

Mr. HICKS. It is not.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it safeguards the Government more in that particular by not providing for any retirement at all until the individual has reached the age of 65 years.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. A lighthouse keeper does not have to go out in boats as the Coast Guard does.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a recognition of the civil retirement principle which the Government employees have been so strenuously seeking for some years past.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. This is the best provision I ever saw. It does not allow them to promote a man to a thousand-dollar salary from \$700 in order to give him \$750 retired pay, but it is based upon the average salary for the last five years.

Mr. HICKS. If the gentleman will permit, he understands the Coast Guard provision is three-quarters of the annual base pay on retirement, and not a provision for graduation, as in this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I well remember the effort which was made that succeeded ultimately in having the Coast Guard retirement provision passed. This, of course, is very much more conservative and safeguards the interests of the Treasury far better and so necessary in these times.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, just a word. The gentleman from New York has pointed out there is this difference between the retirement feature of the Coast Guard, in that there is no retirement here for disability, and he has clearly shown that. I do not imagine that it is important to amend this section at the present time, but my hope is that if this becomes a law we will have an opportunity to see how it works, and possibly, if it is found advisable in the future, a disability retirement may be considered by the very able committee which has brought out this very humane provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the committee if they do not think this would be a good provision to put into this section as an amendment: "*Provided*, That this section shall not take effect until after the present war"? With this increase of pensions, this increase of expenses we are going to in this bill and in other bills, it seems to me we ought to look where we are going and have some regard for the purposes for which the money is being collected by bond sales and sales of war stamps and in all sorts of ways. Now, here is a service that has gone on all these years without a retirement pension law. This is engrafting on the public service a new character of pensions. This character of employees never were pensioned before. Why would it not be the proper thing, in the interest of economy, in the interest of spending the public money that is collected for the purposes of the war for strictly war purposes, that we defer the payment of this class of pensions until the war is over?

Mr. DOREMUS. If the gentleman is directing his question to me, I will say that in my opinion there never has been a time in American history that we can better afford to do justice than we can now. The gentleman correctly states that we have gone along for years and years without this. We are merely doing now what we should have done years ago. And as far as the question of expenses is concerned, there are only 133 men in the service to-day who would be affected by this provision, and the estimated cost is only a trifle over \$100,000 a year.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment so as to ask a question. Would the gentleman state, if he knows, how many classes of public servants we have made beneficiaries of any retirement bill?

Mr. DOREMUS. There are those in the Army and Navy, as the gentleman from Ohio knows; the Public Health Service has a modified form of retirement, and the Coast Guard, which includes the Revenue-Cutter Service and the Life-Saving Service, and which were consolidated, as the gentleman will remember, in the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will my colleague from Michigan permit me?

Mr. DOREMUS. I will.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The retirement provisions contained in the Coast Guard are distinctly of a military and naval character. The provisions are not civil; they are military or naval, and upon this aspect or consideration is the so-called pension and retirement features of the Coast Guard bottomed. It is not a civil pension at all.

Mr. FESS. Are we attempting to extend this sort of legislation to civil employees as well as to military and naval employees?

Mr. DOREMUS. I would hardly so construe it, I will say to my friend from Ohio. The reason which actuated the committee in incorporating section 6 into this bill was the peculiar character of the duties that these men are called upon to perform. We want to put them upon an equality with the men in the Life-Saving Service, and the gentleman will notice in section 6 an express reservation against men who are in offices in charge. And, as I stated some time ago, they were called upon during the year 1917 one hundred and sixty times to save life and property. Twelve of them were killed in the performance of their duty and approximately 200—I do not recall the exact figures—were injured. That is the basis on which we ask for this legislation.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with this section, and with this tendency in legislation, and I wish it were so that we could in due time carry this same sort of legislation to cover our governmental employees, not only for the sake of the employees but especially for the sake of efficiency in the service of the Government.

Mr. DOREMUS. I want to say to my friend from Ohio that I heartily agree with him, and at the risk of making a prophecy I want to say that in my humble judgment the time will come when every department of the Government will be provided with some sort of a retirement system.

Mr. FESS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. DOREMUS. But I do not think this is any precedent for that.

Mr. BLACK. Would the gentleman from Ohio favor a civil retirement bill that would not be framed on the contributory plan?

Mr. FESS. No. I will say frankly that I would not favor any bill that does not take into consideration reasonable frugality on the part of those who were to be benefited and also the basis of contribution.

Mr. BLACK. The suggestion I have as to this particular provision is that these men are civilian employees, and we are starting a precedent here for providing a retirement law that is not framed upon the principle of contribution from the employee.

Mr. FESS. I have no doubt but that would be quoted when we come to considering the other character of legislation. However, this particular service appeals to me so much, those lonely people in the service of the lighthouses, that I would be very glad to support even this, though it is not on that basis. But, as I now see it, I would not support any retirement plan that is not based upon reasonable frugality and contribution.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Just a moment, if my Ohio friend will permit, in order that I may interrogate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS]. He made a statement, I think, a moment ago, that the men in the Lighthouse Service were to be regarded on a par with the Coast Guard. The gentleman, of course, knows that in the Coast Guard the physical requirements are very strict and severe owing to the retirement for physical disability, whereas

in the Lighthouse Service it is not so difficult for a man to enter that service where this feature does not pertain. Of course, in the branch of the service on board lightships the requirements are more stringent.

Mr. DOREMUS. I think the gentleman is correct. But I had reference to the retirement compensation that men were to receive.

Mr. HICKS. The physical requirements are different in the two services, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, with a view of making a brief observation in reference to this retirement system, and that is that in my opinion there is just as good reason for the Lighthouse Service being a part of the Coast Guard as there is for the Life-Saving Service. And having that in view, earlier in the session I introduced a measure to consolidate or merge the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard Service as an incident to creating an executive department of marine and fisheries. That measure, I believe, has been referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I have been assured by the chairman of that committee that a hearing will be had upon that a little later, when the pressure of war matters is relieved.

Now, the Lighthouse Service, as everyone can see, is part of the coast service of the United States or the navigable-water service. The lighthouses and the light vessels are guarding the coasts and the navigable waters of the country, just as the Life-Saving Service is watching the shores and shoals to prevent wrecks and to rescue those in distress, and I think there is good ground for the contention that this great service, consisting of the lighthouses, the storm signals, beacons, buoys, fog warnings, light ships, and their tenders, ought to be constituted a part of the Coast Guard Service of the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That would be especially true as to the entire coast line of the Pacific, from San Diego to Cape Nome, where many of the lighthouses are far distant from settlements, and where the lighthouse tenders actually perform the service of life savers, particularly when the Coast Guard stations and steamers are not within a great many miles.

Mr. WALSH. That is true, and, of course, it would be equally true in some of the inland rivers where they have lights, as well as the Lakes. While disasters of serious consequence may not occur there often, still those light keepers and employees act in the nature of life savers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They are always ready to do that.

Mr. WALSH. Yes. I trust, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this provision for retirement may be adopted and permitted to remain in this bill, and that while it may not necessarily be taken as a precedent for the form of a civil-service retirement law, possibly it may aid in the consideration and favorable action upon the proposition to make the Lighthouse Service a branch of the Coast Guard Service, which latter service in its consolidated form has come to be one of the most valuable and most efficient branches of the Government relating to navigation and the navigable waters of the Republic.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That hereafter a superintendent of lighthouses shall be assigned in charge of each lighthouse district at an annual salary of not exceeding \$3,000 each, except that the salary of the third lighthouse district shall remain at \$3,600, as now fixed by law: *Provided*, That officers now designated as lighthouse inspectors shall be transferred to the positions of superintendent of lighthouses herein authorized in lieu of lighthouse inspectors: *Provided further*, That in the districts which include the Mississippi River and its tributaries the President may designate Army engineers to perform the duties of and act as superintendent of lighthouses without additional compensation.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS] a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McKEOWN. How many superintendents are in the third lighthouse district, where there is a difference of \$600 in the compensation?

Mr. DOREMUS. There is only one superintendent of lighthouses in the United States who gets more than \$2,400, and that is the superintendent at New York.

Mr. McKEOWN. That covers only this one man?

Mr. DOREMUS. That is all; and this bill affects, as I understand, 18 men in the United States.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. DOREMUS. It leaves the salary of the superintendent at New York at what it already was.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That section 4673 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4673. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to regulate the salaries of the respective keepers of lighthouses in such manner as he deems just and proper, but the whole sum allowed for such salaries shall not exceed an average of \$700 per annum for each keeper; and the authority herein granted to regulate the salaries of keepers of lighthouses shall not be abridged or limited by the provisions of section 7 of the general deficiency appropriation act approved August 26, 1912, as amended by section 4 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 4, 1913." (U. S. Stats. L., vol. 37, p. 790.)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend this section by striking out, in line 23, page 5, the figures "\$700" and inserting "\$840."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 5, line 23, strike out "\$700" and insert in lieu thereof "\$840."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. SHALLENBERGER, as Speaker pro tempore, having assumed the chair, Mr. Cox, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11284) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DOREMUS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. DOREMUS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2298) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, report No. 153, be laid on the table. That is a former lighthouse bill, introduced by former Chairman Adamson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 6, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation to provide increase of pay of female operatives, printers' assistants, and skilled helpers employed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for inclusion in the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. Doc. No. 1148), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 294) providing for

the time of application of the method of determining quotas of forces to be raised for military service as authorized in a joint resolution approved May 16, 1918, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 626), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 12391) to amend section 1044 of the Revised Statutes relating to limitations in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12392) to authorize the formation and organization of corporations for the transaction and conduct of commerce with foreign nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12393) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for writs of error in certain instances in criminal cases," approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 12394) to authorize the establishment of a bureau of farm-risk insurance in the Agricultural Department; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUSTED: Resolution (H. Res. 387) authorizing the appointment of a committee to inquire into the causes of the recent aviation accidents; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 12395) granting a pension to Maria A. Struman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12396) granting an increase of pension to Israel Wilkie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12397) granting an increase of pension to Thomas K. Franklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 12398) granting a pension to Henry Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 12399) for the relief of Dennis Shevlin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 12400) granting a pension to Lucy W. Lockwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 12401) granting an increase of pension to William McQueen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the First District, California, Congress of Mothers, favoring osteopathic physicians in Medical Corps of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Illinois Christian Missionary Society and Ernest C. Wareting, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Woman's Home Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church, Canton (Ohio) district, asking passage of a bone-dry law as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of members of Lodge No. 220, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, and Helpers of America, against increase in second-class mail postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of South Washington Citizens' Association, asking an appropriation to establish a ferry line and suitable landings at the foot of Seventh Street SW. to East Potomac Park; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DYER: Resolution of the American Pediatric Society, approving and urging the passage of the Owen-Dyer bill, which provides for commensurate rank for the Medical Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of Converse Cooperage Co., Western Motor Car Co., and Leslie Carroll Hollingshead, of Chicago, Ill.; Atlas Hoop Corporation, of Carlithersville, Mo.; Haddorff Piano Co., of Rockford, Ill.; and E. P. Fassett, of Mendota, Ill., protesting against the repeal or postponement of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Resolution adopted by Post D, Travelers' Protective Association of America, Lancaster, Pa., proposing adoption by the Government of a Federal war-time policy in respect of highway improvement; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of sundry citizens of Hastings, Mich., asking for the repeal of the zone system for magazine postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Motherhood Club, of Rocky Hill, Conn., for the repeal of the postage amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of the Select and Common Councils of Philadelphia, requesting the Shipping Board be urged to provide adequate dry-dock facilities for shipping purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Memorial from residents and legal electors of the State of California, members of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Normandie Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, and one from other residents of Los Angeles, Cal., urging the enactment of legislation that will prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicants during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a petition of Guy C. Stoddard and other citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., in favor of immediate enactment of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 6, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that at the front our boys are standing face to face with death, laughing in its face. They are not afraid, for there has arisen a new sense of God. They have carried with them the unconquerable spirit of their fathers and the beautiful and simple and never-dying faith of their mothers. They fight under our flag, which is a symbol of freedom. They are not afraid. We pray that we who stand back of them may be shaken out of ourselves into the same abandon of courage and faith and may support them with all the powers of a Nation consecrated to the freedom of the world. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE SELECTIVE DRAFT.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, yesterday was the first anniversary of the draft. The registration and classification of 10,000,000 men constitute a supreme example of American efficiency, as well as a wonderful tribute to the genius of Gen. Crowder. I have here a statement by Gen. Crowder describing the operation of the draft during the first year. I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE PROVOST MARSHAL GENERAL, WASHINGTON.

The Provost Marshal General has sent to all the governors for publication to local and district boards the following telegram:

"One year ago occurred the first registration for military purposes of the young manhood of the Nation. Ten million men responded in a single day. This accomplishment was nothing short of marvelous. The task of utilizing this enormous force seemed unachievable. But the work of classification of this great mass of man power in such a way as to permit of its organization and molding into an effective army was intrusted to 4,663 local boards and 156 district boards, constituting a force of nearly 15,000 of the leading citizens of every community, who, assisted in their work by more than 100,000 equally patriotic volunteers, have performed a work that challenges the attention and excites the admiration of all our people.

"Well may we pause to-day, while another million of our youths enter the lists, and survey the results of the year's work. Each registrant has been examined and his availability for military service has been determined. In other words, these millions of men have been classified in such a manner that the Nation may now call for them to come forward into the Army. No call can be so large that it will not be filled immediately, whether the number be such as may be filled by those who have been found to stand in the first rank of availables or so great that men standing in the second, third, or fourth ranks of availability must go forward. In other words, all these millions of men who one year ago were an inert mass have become a mobile army. Each has found his place and each in his proper turn has marched or awaits the order to march.

"These results could not have been accomplished except through the devoted and unselfish labor of patriots. The local and district boards have scored an unprecedented triumph and have earned the undying gratitude of the Nation. Their achievement is one of the great successes of the war. They have already sent into camp, including those under orders for June mobilization, an army of more than a million and a half men.